Duquesne University

A MANUAL
OF
APOLOGETICS

P-21
1753

BY THE
REV. F. J. KOCH

TRANSLATED FROM THE REVISED GERMAN EDITION
BY
A. M. BUCHANAN, M.A. (LONDON)

REVISED AND EDITED
BY THE
REV. CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.
Professor at St. Charles Seminary,
Overbrook, Pa.

NEW YORK
JOSEPH F. WAGNER

239
K76

Nihil Obstat

REMIGIUS LAFORT, S.T.D.

Censor

Imprimatur

✠ JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY

Archbishop of New York

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 14, 1915

B+1101
K75

Copyright, 1915, by JOSEPH F. WAGNER (Inc.), New York

EDITOR'S PREFACE

NEVER has the necessity of an intellectual defence of Catholic principles been more imperative and general than in our days, when every department of human knowledge is made to yield weapons for a concerted and systematic attack on the very foundations of supernatural belief. The front of the attack has broadened, for, it is no longer confined to the scientific world, but extends to popular literature. Hence what was formerly the duty and privilege of the clergy becomes now the universal task of all educated Catholic laymen.

Every reflecting Catholic must render to himself an account of the faith that is within him. None but an enlightened faith will be proof against the crafty and villainous onslaught of modern infidelity, which is magnificently equipped for its work of destruction. Ignorance of fundamental principles is the treacherous rock on which faith has frequently been wrecked. Many a man harbours in his heart a secret distrust of his most sacred convictions, because he has never taken the trouble to examine the strong foundation on which they rest. Thus a man owes it to himself to investigate the rational grounds of his faith and to study the motives which have prompted his firm assent to revealed truth. It will give him a peaceful sense of intellectual assurance when he finds that, in adhering to revelation, he does not abdicate reason, but elicits

NOV 23 '28
2386

the most sublime act of enlightened reason. The little effort devoted to such studies will be amply rewarded by a deepening of religious convictions and a greater cheerfulness of faith.

Particularly is it to be deplored that the clamorous methods of infidels so readily mislead the young, who do not realize the utter worthlessness and shallowness of their plausible objections. There is only one remedy, and that is a thorough knowledge of the intellectual basis of faith. It is most opportune to enable young men to justify their faith to themselves and to make them see that it is the infidel, and not the believer, who stands condemned by reason and common sense. Religious knowledge must keep pace with the general progress of one's education or else a weakening of the faith that seems discredited by the new information will be the inevitable result.

From a serious inquiry into the impregnable foundations of divine truth a joyous faith will spring that glories in the consciousness of its strength and falters not in the presence of difficulties brought forth by infidelity and sectarianism.

The Catholic Church has a right to expect that her sons be able to vindicate her claims against the arrogance of her enemies. The honour of the Church lies in the hands of her children. They should acquire such knowledge as will make it possible for them to refute the specious arguments of irreverent infidelity and to discover the flaws in the logic of heresy. Every man should make it his duty to come to the defence of the position and claims of his Church and by sound arguments to silence, if not to convince, her adversaries. It is also a duty of the more educated Catholics

to come to the rescue of their less favoured brethren and to protect them by judicious instruction against the persistent attempts of unbelievers to undermine their simple faith. Here are lofty aims for our Catholic laymen, a splendid opportunity for the exercise of the lay apostolate.

The latter, however, reaches out farther. Besides malicious opponents of Christianity there are also (and I believe that they are the larger class) honest inquirers and earnest seekers after the truth. To whom should these look for information and guidance but to the educated Catholic layman with whom they come into daily contact through business or social relations? It is a great work of charity to remove the obstacles that beset the path of inquiry and to lead the seeking brother to the threshold of the saving fold.

In our days, when religious matters are a frequent topic of discussion, the Catholic man unacquainted with the arguments that prove the divine character and eminent reasonableness of his faith is a sad and pathetic figure. Truly, apologetical knowledge is an imperative need.

The present volume wishes to meet this want of our times. Its pages contain a systematic, yet withal sufficiently popular, vindication of our faith. In a concise and lucid form it presents a summary of fundamental theology. The success to which the German original attained has suggested the translation. Avoiding purely technical phraseology, it is addressed to the student and the average educated Catholic desirous of rounding out his religious knowledge. Though mainly adapted to the requirements of a seminary course, it can be perused with profit by any one who is willing

to give serious thought to the most tremendous issues of human existence.

The spirit in which the work is conceived and carried out is conciliatory and sympathetic; it does not so much aim at defeating the adversary, but rather endeavours to win him over to a confession of the truth. The living issues of the day receive special attention and occupy the foreground. Lines of thought are suggested which will stimulate the spirit of inquiry. The various helps which the printer's art commands are utilized to facilitate study by visualizing the trend of the discussion and allowing of a rapid survey of the contents of a page.

The nature and scope of the book seem not to call for an exhaustive bibliography, and therefore the pages have not been overcrowded with bibliographical references. Wherever a quotation from a foreign author could be easily duplicated by one from writers of our own tongue, the latter has been given the preference.

The scarcity of works of this kind in English and its own intrinsic merits bespeak for the volume, in its present form, an enlarged sphere of usefulness.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

FEAST OF THE ASSUMPTION, 1915.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTORY — PAGE

The Meaning, Object, and Need of Apologetics 1
The Ultimate End of Man 3
Nature of Religion 5
Value of Religion 7
Universality of Religion 9
Origin of Religion 11

2. THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Knowability of God's Existence 15
Development of the Proofs of God's Existence 17
Atheism 23

3. THE NATURE OF GOD

Our Knowledge of God 27
The Attributes of God 30
The Unity of God 34
Polytheism 35

4. GOD'S WORK

I. Creation, Preservation, and Government of the Universe
The Creation of the World 38
Materialism and Pantheism 39
The Hexahemeron 47
Object of the Creation 51
Preservation and Government of the World 53

II. Creation, Original Condition, and Fall of Man
Divine Origin of Man 56
The Nature of the Human Soul 60
Man as a Natural Image of God 62
The Supernatural Likeness of Man to God 66
Unity of the Human Race 68
Table of Languages 70
Antiquity of the Human Race 71
Primitive Condition of Man 73
The Fall of Man 74
Original Sin 75
The Promise of a Future Redemption 80

5. THE WORD OF GOD

PAGE

I. Divine Revelation in General
Meaning of the Word "Revelation" 81
Possibility of Revelation 82
Necessity of Revelation 82
How Revelation May be Known 85
Miracles and Prophecies 85
The Fact of Revelation 89
Sources of Revelation 90
II. The Pre-Christian Revelation
The Books of the Old Testament 90
The Authenticity of the Old Testament 93
Integrity of the Old Testament Texts 95
Trustworthiness of the Old Testament 96
Preparation for the Redeemer 100
The Expectation of the Redeemer 102
III. The Christian Revelation
The Books of the New Testament 103
Authenticity of the New Testament 106
Integrity of the Text of the New Testament 108
Trustworthiness of the New Testament 109
Primitive Text and Translations of Holy Scripture 114

6. THE SON OF GOD

The Messianic Character of Christ 118
The Divinity of Jesus Christ 121
The Divinity of Christ Proved by His Sanctity 123
The Divinity of Christ Proved by His Teaching 126
The Divinity of Christ Proved by His Miracles 133
The Divinity of Christ Proved by His Resurrection 135
The Divinity of Christ Proved by His Prophecies 139
The Divinity of Christ Proved by the Apostles' Teaching 141
The Divinity of Christ, and the Teaching of the Catholic Church 143
The Humanity of Jesus Christ 144

7. THE KINGDOM OF GOD

I. The Nature, Marks, and Attributes of the Church
Foundation, Mission, and Constitution of the Church 149
The Primacy of St. Peter and His Successors 153
The Episcopate 158
The Church as a Visible Society 161
The Characteristic Marks of the Church 164
The Attributes of the Church 172
The Infallibility of the Church 173
The Church, the Necessary Means of Salvation 179
The Communion of Saints 185
II. Inspiration and Canon of Holy Scripture
The Church and the Sources of Our Faith 187
Tradition 190
III. The Church and the Christian Rule of Faith
The Rule of Faith 194
Necessity of Faith 200
The Nature and Attributes of Faith 203

A MANUAL OF APOLOGETICS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The Meaning, Object, and Need of Apologetics

APOLOGETICS (*ἀπολογεῖσθαι*, to defend oneself) is the science concerned with the defence of Christianity. It establishes the divine character of the Christian religion and refutes the arguments of its opponents.

Dogmatics is concerned with the various dogmas of faith and shows that they are based upon Holy Scripture and tradition, the sources of our faith. *Apologetics* deals with the foundations and sources of faith itself and derives its arguments chiefly from reason and history. Where reference is made to Holy Scripture, it is primarily as to an historical record.

The aim of apologetics is to prove the reasonableness of our faith. Faith takes for granted the existence and veracity of God and is based upon the fact of a divine revelation and of its preservation by the Church. To establish these preliminary truths is the principal aim of apologetics. Its further and secondary object is to defend the individual truths of faith against doubt and error.

Whoever has received by baptism the Christian faith is rendered by grace perfectly certain of it and experiences its truth and power in the course of his life. Apologetics supplies him with positive proofs and with a scientific knowledge of the natural grounds of his belief.

The need for apologetics arises from the fact that man reflects and inquires. Every thoughtful Christian ought to be able to give an account of the convictions bearing on his eternal destiny.

St. Peter exhorted the Christians to be "ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you." (1 Peter iii, 15.)

The attacks to which Christianity is exposed constitute another reason for the existence of apologetics. Early enemies, Jews, pagans, and heretics, as a rule, challenged only isolated doctrines, but modern unbelievers often assail the very foundations of Christianity.

The chief Christian apologists of antiquity are: *Justin* (second century), *Origen* (born about 185 A.D.), *Minutius Felix* (born about 180), *Tertullian* (born 160), and *St. Augustine* (353–430, de civit. Dei). In the Middle Ages *St. Thomas Aquinas* (1225–1274) wrote his "Summa contra Gentiles" to defend Christianity against Arabian philosophers.

Of Catholic works of an apologetical nature that appeared in our age may be mentioned the following: *Devivier-Messmer,* Christian Apologetics; *Bagshawe,* Credentials of the Catholic Church; *Balmes,* Letters to a Sceptic; *Orestes Brownson,* Liberalism and the Church; *Driscoll,* Christian Philosophy, Pragmatism and the Problem of the Idea; *Gibbons,* Faith of our Fathers; *Jouin,* S.J., Evidences of Christianity; *Lambert,* Answers to Ingersoll; *Newman,* Grammar of Assent; *Schanz,* A Christian Apology; *Spalding,* Religion, Agnosticism, and Education; *Spalding,* J.M., Evidences of Catholicity; *Thein,* The Bible and Rationalism; *Vaughan,* Reasonableness of Christianity; *Ward,* The Wish to Believe; *Halpin,* Apologetica; *Aveling,* The God of Philosophy; *Hammerstein,* Edgar, or From Atheism to the Full Truth; *Hull,* S.J., God, Man, and Religion; *Lanslots,* O.S.B., Reasonable Service; *McGloin,* The Light of Faith; *Otien,* S.J., Why Should I Believe?; *Hill,* S.J., The Catholic's Ready Answer; *Wasmann,* S.J., Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution; *Mausbach,* Catholic Moral Teaching and its Antagonists; *Donat,* S.J., The Freedom of Science; *Fouard,* The Life of Christ; *Bougaud,* The Divinity of Christ;

Russo, S.J., The True Religion; *Thurston,* The Truth of Christianity; *Raupert,* Roads to Rome; *Seisenberger,* Handbook of Bible Study; *Walsh,* The Popes and Science; *Kneller,* Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science; *Allies,* The Formation of Christendom; *Lilly,* Christianity and Modern Civilization; *Gasquet,* O.S.B., Eve of the Reformation; *Grisar,* S.J., Luther; *Martindale,* S.J., History of Religions; The Catholic Encyclopedia; *Turner,* History of Philosophy; Westminster Lectures.

The Ultimate End of Man

Man recognizes that he is a wanderer on earth; his last aim is not this world, nor anything that it can offer, but God. His intellect strives after infinite truth; his heart yearns after infinite goodness; his imagination longs for infinite beauty; and his whole being tends towards everlasting life. Now God alone is infinite.

It is in this sense that *St. Augustine* writes: "Thou hast made us, O God, for thyself; and our hearts are ever restless, until they find rest in Thee." (Conf., l. I, c. 1.)

God might have given Himself to us in a manner which would correspond to the exigencies of our nature and thus have satisfied our instinctive craving for happiness. In this case He would have been our *natural* last end. But He holds out to us the prospect of good things far surpassing the needs of our nature. We are to behold Him face to face and in this contemplation enjoy eternal bliss. We have a *supernatural* final end.

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him." (1 Cor. ii, 9.) "This is eternal life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." (John xvii, 3.)

The good things of this world cannot be man's final end, because they are imperfect and perishable; they possess a value only in virtue of being means towards his final end. Hence we should value and use them only in so far as they help us to attain our final end.

The dignity of the Christian view of life lies in its regarding all earthly things *sub specie aeternitatis.* It teaches men to know, love, and serve God and to regard this as the main object of their life. "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own soul?" (Matth. xvi, 26.)

Philosophers in every age have busied themselves with the question of man's ultimate destiny, but no satisfactory solution has been discovered except in Christianity. *Marcus Varro,* a Roman writer, showed that if philosophers were classified according to their answer to this question, there were no less than two hundred and eighty-eight schools of thought. (*Augustine,* de civit. Dei, l. XIX, c. 1, n. 1.)

1. *The theories of antiquity.* The *Stoics,* who were followers of *Zeno,* taught that man's highest aim and duty in life was to live conformably to nature. The *Epicureans* taught men to balance pleasure and pain and to regulate their lives so as to have the maximum of enjoyment and the minimum of suffering. *Pythagoras* maintained that the highest aim of life was to secure inward harmony in the soul and thus to attain to a resemblance with God. *Socrates* considered the happiness resulting from knowledge and virtue to be the highest good. *Aristippus* regarded pleasure as the supreme aim of life (hedonism). The *Cynic* philosophers, following *Diogenes,* thought that the highest life was one free from all needs and, as far as possible, independent of accidental circumstances. In *Plato* the ethical teaching of the ancient world reached a higher level, for he insisted upon justice based on fear of God and obedience to law, whilst *Aristotle* regarded virtue as the indispensable means of obtaining happiness. Pagan ethical teaching, generally, does nothing more than inculcate wisdom and virtue without reference to a supreme end.

2. *Modern theories.* The *doctrine of evolution* represents a

progress in civilization which eventually will usher in an era of moral and social perfection and of complete happiness, as the goal of existence. (*John Stuart Mill, Darwin, H. Spencer.*) *Materialism* and *pantheism* deny all moral responsibility and the existence of any higher aim for the individual. *Kant* (*G. T. Ladd*) regarded the "categorical imperative" of duty as the rule governing human action, without, however, giving it any foundation, since his moral teaching is not based upon the unchanging will of God. *Nietzsche* preached the "morality of the beast of prey," for he declared it to be the duty of mankind to produce the superman by ruthlessly crushing the weak and the unfit. *Pessimism,* as represented by *Schopenhauer* and *von Hartmann,* considers human existence as utterly aimless and worthless and looks upon the cessation of all being as the only thing desirable. *Pragmatism* (cf. *James*) makes success and expediency the criterion of goodness and destroys all ethical values.

3. Many *great poets* have recorded their opinions regarding the aim of human life. *Dante* taught that it consists in being cleansed from sin and drawing near to God. In his Faust *Goethe* renounces all hope of attaining to any certainty capable of satisfying the intellect and seeks happiness in a temperate enjoyment of life ennobled by the contemplation of nature and art. *Shakespeare* expresses the misery of a theory of life that has not God as its final aim in the words:

"Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player,
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more; it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing." (Macbeth, V, 5.)

Nature of Religion

Religion is the union of man with God, arising from faith, love, and grace and manifesting itself in the service of God.

Religion has its origin in man's dependence upon God as his Creator and final end.

By His revelation God enlightens the mind of man (faith); by His commandments He directs the will (love); by grace He bestows the beginning and preliminary condition of eternal life (hope). Religion has its outward manifestation in the liturgical

and practical service of God (worship and morality). "Religion is the bond of grace and duty, by which we are bound to God." (*Lactantius,* div. instit., IV, 28.)

Religion in the subjective sense is the habitual disposition of man to render to God the honour which is due to Him. In the objective sense it signifies a system of truths, laws, and practices which regulate divine worship. Hence the teaching of faith and morals, as well as public worship, belongs to the essence of religion.

If a man consistently practises his religion, he is said to possess the virtue of religion. Etymologically the word *religion* is derived:

(*a*) By *Cicero* (de nat. deor., II, 28) from *relegere* (stem *lag,* to attend to, care for), carefully to perceive one's duties towards God: *Qui omnia, quae ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tanquam religerent, sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo.*

(*b*) By *St. Augustine* (de civit. Dei, X, 3) from *reeligere,* to choose again: *Deum eligentes vel potius reeligentes, amiseramus enim negligentes.*

(*c*) By *Lactantius* (div. instit., c. IV) from *religare,* to bind: *Vinculo pietatis Deo religati sumus, unde ipsa religio nomen accepit, non, ut Cicero interpretatus est, a relegendo.*

As God is the supernatural, final end of man, and religion is the means designed by Him for the attainment of this end, religion itself must also be supernatural. It is not enough for man to know, love, and serve God with his natural powers, but he needs a superior knowledge of God, such as is supplied by revelation, and a higher power, such as is imparted by grace.

1. Neither rationalism nor deism rise to an adequate conception of religion. The former denies that God has come into contact with man by revelation; the latter overlooks the possibility of a supernatural elevation of man by faith and love.

As samples of narrow and erroneous opinions regarding the nature of religion we may quote the following definitions. *Kant*

identified religion with morality, whilst *Fichte* thought that it was merely knowledge, having no connection with morality. *Hegel* considered that religion consisted in perfect liberty, in the "self-consciousness of the absolute in the human mind." *Schleiermacher* regarded it as the feeling of dependence; *Auguste Comte* as devotion to humanity in general; *Feuerbach* as selfishness and the gratification of human desires; *Matthew Arnold* as "morality touched by emotion." According to *Fr. Steudel,* religious sentiment is a matter of the imagination. *E. von Hartmann* calls it a mystical emotion, and *John Stuart Mill* described it as "the earnest direction of the emotions and desires towards an ideal object." *Fr. Paulsen* called it the feeling of reverence for the universal, and *Th. Ziegler* the sense of infinite desire.

2. Revealed or positive religion embraces most of the truths of natural religion (the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will). But no purely natural religion has ever of itself existed, because God's revelation has influenced the religions of all nations. The systems of natural religion elaborated by some philosophers have never become popular, but have always been confined to a small circle of their adherents.

Value of Religion

Religion is of the utmost importance to the individual.

1. It connects man with God, his origin and final end.

2. It satisfies the noblest cravings of man's nature, viz., his desire for truth, goodness, and happiness.

3. It supplies him with a firm foundation for moral action.

True religion teaches that God is the source of truth, that His will is the rule of all moral action, and that peace in and with God is true happiness. It directs man in his efforts to attain what is good and preserves him from doubt and error. Religion raises man above irrational creatures and perfects and completes his nature.

Religion is of the greatest importance to human society.

1. It ennobles the relations between man and man by teaching that all men are brothers, the children of the same Father.

2. It elevates family life.

The family is the foundation of society and of the state. Without religion men would not endure the trials and sacrifices required by a permanent and well regulated family life. Where religion is discarded, family life decays.

3. It secures respect for duty and law.

Religion represents laws as the expression of a higher will and makes them binding on the conscience. In every age legislators and philosophers have borne witness to this fact. *Cicero* writes (de nat. deor., I, 2): "It seems probable that, when fear of God vanishes, all good faith and social order among the human race perish." *St. Augustine* (de civit. Dei, IV, 4): "If justice is destroyed, what are kingdoms but great robberies?"

"Authorities might be piled up indefinitely to illustrate the consensus that prevails as to the necessity of religion for a practical observance of morality." (*Fox*, Religion and Morality.) *George Washington* uttered the following beautiful words: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensible supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. . . . Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle. It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government." (Farewell Address.)

4. It promotes the temporal welfare of nations.

All industrial progress depends upon security of life and property, which only religion can declare sacred and thus effectively protect. The higher the standard of civilization, the greater are the demands made upon each individual for a conscientious discharge of his obligations. This is obvious, for instance, in the case of factories and railways. A workman's personal interest is not enough to secure the performance of difficult and arduous tasks unless his sense of duty is reinforced by religious motives.

5. It encourages intellectual progress.

All the early literary productions and legends of civilized nations bear the impress of religion, which was the chief inspiration of science, literature, and art. The history of the nations of antiquity is to a great extent religious history, and religion has never ceased to exert a great influence on national life as a whole. *Goethe* remarks that the chief and most profound theme of history, to which all others are subordinate, is the conflict between unbelief and belief. All epochs in which faith prevailed were brilliant, full of inspiration, and fruitful in lasting works. But, on the other hand, all epochs in which unbelief triumphed, though they may have possessed a temporary lustre, vanished and made no permanent mark upon posterity. (Westöstlicher Divan.)

According to the evidence of history, whenever religion has been at a low ebb, social, political, and economic decay has resulted invariably, though not always immediately. (Downfall of the civilized nations of antiquity, the French Revolution, modern anarchism.)

Universality of Religion

Religion is a primitive, universal, and constant phenomenon in the life of nations.

1. Philology proves that the most important groups of languages have one common name for the supreme God, and therefore the primitive races using these languages must all have worshipped that God. We can trace this identity in the name of God among the languages belonging to the Indo-European,[1] the Semitic,[2] and the Ugrian-Finnish families,[3] as well as among the South Sea Islanders.[4] The Indo-European languages carry us back to the cradle of humanity.

2. Recent excavations and literary discoveries have thrown some light on the primitive history of the human race, and the modes of burial (with weapons, ornaments, and tools) as well as

[1] Dyaus-Pitar, Ζεῦς πατήρ, Jupiter, Zio, deus, devas, δῖος, dievas, tivar.
[2] Elohim, Alloho, Allah, Iluh.
[3] Iumalu, Iubmel, Iumal, Num.
[4] Mana.

the position of the dead (in the attitude of sleep and facing the east) point to a belief in the continuance of life after death and the connection between mankind and the world of departed spirits.

3. Both in ancient and modern times it has been alleged that savage races existed destitute of all religious notions. But much of the testimony relied upon has been found deceptive and in some cases self-contradictory. Professor *Flint* has conclusively shown that no value attaches to many of the instances adduced by Sir *John Lubbock* and other allegations of travellers put forward in proof that atheistic races do exist. Many tribes conceal their religion from strangers; in others the religious sense is so faint that a very thorough acquaintance is necessary before it can be discovered. All nations living in a state of nature regard their religion as having come down to them from a remote past. It is a mistake to suppose that the nations professing Buddhism have no real religion, for popular Buddhism is the worship of Buddha, and theoretical Buddhism is still a religion, though of a low order, since it connects the life of man on earth with an end to be attained after death.

"Cities can be found without walls, without literature, without kings, without palaces, without coinage, without theatres and wrestling schools, but no one has ever seen, or ever will see, a city without a sanctuary and a deity, without prayers, oaths, prophecies, and sacrifices offered to obtain what is good and avert what is evil." (*Plutarch*, adv. Colot., c. 31.)

"The statement," writes *Tiele*, "that there are nations or tribes which possess no religion rests either on inaccurate observations or on a confusion of ideas. No tribe or nation has yet been met with destitute of a belief in any higher being, and travellers who have asserted their existence have been afterwards refuted by facts. It is legitimate, therefore, to call religion, in its most general sense, the universal phenomenon of humanity." (History of Religion.)

According to the *object* venerated, religions may be classified as natural and supernatural.

As man cannot directly behold God, but knows Him only by His revelation in nature, there has always existed a possibility of confounding cause and effect and of substituting the worship of nature for the worship of nature's God. Such confusion, however, has never been universal, and many religions have distinguished the Creator from His creation.

According to the *purpose* of veneration, religions may be classified as magical, nomistic or legal, and religions of redemption.

In magical religions the ceremonial is a sort of witchcraft, which is thought efficacious irrespective of the moral disposition of the worshipper. Nomistic religions lay down rules for human conduct. Religions of redemption have their origin in man's consciousness of sin. Modern scientific students of religion sometimes apply expressions that have a definite meaning in Christianity to non-Christian religions; this is a fruitful source of error. When they speak of "Holy Scripture," "the Law," and "Redemption" in pagan religions, these expressions should be understood only in a general and primitive sense, quite unlike that which they bear in the revelation of the Old and the New Testament.

Origin of Religion

According to the testimony of Holy Scripture, the fundamental truths of religion were divinely revealed to man at the beginning, and this testimony is confirmed by history.

The monotheistic worship of one supreme Lord of heaven is common to the earliest traditions of all the Indo-European nations, the Chinese, the Turanian and Finnish races, the Sumerians and Akkadians (ancient Babylonians), the Semitic nations and the Egyptians. A monotheistic idea can be traced in the traditions of the Slavs, Mexicans, and Peruvians. A monotheistic conception of the Deity underlies likewise the polytheism of the Greeks and Romans (Ζεῦς, μοῖρα, Jupiter).

The Sanskrit Dyaus-pitar, father of heaven, is in Greek Ζεῦς πατήρ, in Latin Jupiter, Diespiter, in Scandinavian Zio, and in Gothic Tius. The various names for God — deva, θεός, deus, Lithuanian diewas, Old Prussian diews, etc.— may all be derived from the root *dyu*, to shine. Before the Indo-European nations were scattered they had one God, or at least one supreme deity; it was only after they had separated that their conception of God was altered, and instead of Dyu the Hindoos worshipped Varuna and Indra, the Persians Ahura Mazdao (Ormuzd = wise Lord) and Angro-Mainzus (Ahriman), whilst the Germanic peoples adored Wodin or Wuotan and his companions, besides

Dyu, whose name appears under the forms of Tye, Zio, Tiw, Tius, etc. That the Homeric mythology replaced among the Greeks a purer conception of God is quite evident, since mythology recorded the previous supremacy of Kronos and his dethronement by Zeus. The primitive idea of the gods was very simple. There was *one* God of heaven and earth, whose consort was Rhea; their offspring were the Titans, whose overthrow by Jupiter marked the introduction of a fresh dynasty. Among the Romans Jupiter (Optimus Maximus) and Juno succeeded an earlier pair of Gods, viz., Janus (Dianus) and Diana. It is impossible to prove that this primitive monotheism was the outgrowth of any earlier and lower form of religion.

The assertion that religion originated in the imagination and mind of man, and that monotheism was only a transition stage between fetishism or animism on the one hand and atheistic monism on the other, is contrary to reason and to the facts of history.

Under the influence of the modern idea of evolution an attempt has been made by atheistic scholars to show that religion is merely a phase of the universal process of evolution. *Reville* (Prolegomènes sur l'histoire des religions) classifies religions in the following order: primitive natural religion (worship of nature), animistic and fetishist religions, national mythologies, polytheistic and legal, then universal religions of redemption (Buddhism), and lastly monotheistic religions. *Bousset* (Wesen der Religion, 1905) gives the following classification: private religions, national religions, prophetic religions, legal religions, religions of redemption. Other arrangements are given by *Lubbock, Tiele,* and *Siebeck.* Such attempts are of a purely arbitrary nature, devoid of all historical foundation.

It is impossible to derive the primitive religion of mankind from psychological factors such as fear, dreams, fever, or ecstasy.

1. *Fear* is a depressed attitude of mind towards some impending evil and bears in itself no relation to any supramundane force. It may be evoked by a wild beast, a natural phenomenon, or a human being of superior strength. A religious element is present only when there is a thought of some higher being controlling these forces, but this thought is produced, not by the

sentiment of fear, but by the perception that the impending evils are finite and limited. The feeling of fear gives rise to thoughts of religion only in as far as it impels men to pray. Fear could never be a satisfactory explanation of the worship offered to beneficent deities.

2. Even savages of a low type know that there is no reality in things seen in dreams or under morbid conditions of mind. Such visions can be called up by the imagination at any time.

3. The old theory that religion originated in a system of deception on the part of priests or legislators is now no longer maintained; where there is no religion there can be no priests, and where there is no religious reverence an appeal to the gods would have no meaning.

4. It is a mistake to regard fetishism or animism as a primitive form of religion. *Fetishism* (from the Portuguese *fejticio, facticius,* magic) presupposes the use of reason, of which no beast is capable. The fetish worshipper believes in a personal being able to grant his prayers, although it resides in the fetish. The idea that this spirit is necessarily connected with the fetish has been superimposed upon the correct opinion that it is possible for the deity to come into contact with man only under some sensible form, since man cannot take direct cognizance of anything outside the scope of his senses. *Animism,* the worship of ancestors, is based upon belief in the immortality of the soul and some conception of God. An animist believes that the soul after death passes into a higher sphere and possesses greater power than during life. Such a belief cannot have originated in death itself, which is to the outward eye an extinction of all faculties. It arose from the fact that participation in the power of some higher being was ascribed to the departed soul. Fetishism and animism are not primitive stages in the evolution of religion, but degenerate forms of an originally purer faith. Religion came into existence at the same moment as human intelligence.

"There exists among the most primitive races, even among those which have never come into close contact with Europeans or Mahometans, a faith in some supreme Being, generally regarded as the Creator, who is Himself good and who demands of man that he should act rightly, justly, and morally. This Being existed before the world and its inhabitants and is superior to death. This belief is one of the elementary ideas of the human race." (*Leopold von Schröder,* professor of Indology, Vienna.) "Without having recourse to psychological analysis of doubtful value, and contested assumptions as to the conditions

which surrounded primeval man, we perceive an obvious inherent characteristic of the human mind common to all stages of development, which is amply sufficient to account for the appearance of religious beliefs and practices. This characteristic is the impulse of ascribing every perceived effect to some cause." (*Fox*, Religion and Morality.)

The atheistic view of religion is wrong regarding the early stages, the successive developments, and the end of religion. The transition from monotheism to monism, whether materialistic or pantheistic, is not a step forward, but a retrograde movement, marking the decay of all true religion.

By a special providence the Jewish nation preserved the religion originally revealed, and it was brought to perfection by Jesus Christ and kept alive in the Catholic Church; therefore the Catholic religion is the only true religion.

This statement is discussed and proved in the following chapters, dealing with the existence of God, the nature of God, the work of God, the word of God, the Son of God, the kingdom of God.

CHAPTER II

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Knowability of God's Existence

BY means of his reason man is able to recognize God's existence with perfect certainty. Hence *St. Paul* declares the unbelief of the pagan world to be inexcusable, "for the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also and divinity." (Rom. i, 20.)

The Church also teaches, as the Vatican Council declared, "that God, the beginning and end of all things, can be known with certainty from created things by means of the natural light of human reason." The arguments for God's existence establish the reasonableness of faith in God and the unreasonableness of atheism. They supply a natural support to supernatural faith.

These arguments are not intended to beget for the first time a conviction of the existence of God, for such a conviction is already possessed by every Christian and is rendered clearer by revelation and grace. Nor do they pretend to substitute intellectual conviction for faith, since the certainty of faith stands on a higher level than that of the intellect. They are important, however, because they open to man the highest sphere of cognition and facilitate his perception of the harmony between faith and reason.

Even *Aristotle* thought that man possessed naturally a consciousness of the existence of the gods, and *Cicero* speaks of a knowledge of the gods anterior to any instruction.

"The existence of God is so evident, in the order of direct thought, that it may be said to be naturally known. Yet, in the

reflex order of thought, where one goes back from the simple spontaneous certainty about things, to a scientific study of their nature, and to an ultimate analysis of their proofs, this truth, like all other truths that are almost self-evident, may sometimes become obscured. The change from the clear but superficial view of common sense to the clear insight of philosophy must bring its period of difficulty and its peril of doubt." (*Kane,* S.J., God or Chaos.)

Line of argument. The arguments for God's existence are derived from the things of nature, which are objects of our experience; from these we deduce the fact of a First Cause, using the self-evident principle of causality.

Various kinds of arguments. The various kinds of arguments by which our reason proves with absolute certainty the existence of God may be classified as follows:

1. *The cosmological argument,* which infers

(*a*) From the existence of the visible world (which does not exist necessarily) the existence of some Cause different from it and superior to it.

(*b*) From the movement and life in the world the existence of some original Giver of life and movement.

2. *The teleological argument,* which infers from the design manifest in the world the existence of a wise and powerful Creator.

3. *The moral argument,* which infers from the voice of conscience, making known to us God's holy will and admonishing us with irresistible authority, the existence of One who punishes the wicked and rewards the good.

4. *The historical argument,* which infers the existence of a supreme Being from the universal conviction of mankind that there is a God.

Development of the Proofs of God's Existence

1. *The Cosmological Proof*

1. *From the existence of the universe.* Things exist, and whatever exists does so either independently, in which case its existence is said to be necessary, or through the agency of something else, in which case its existence is contingent.

Nothing in the world exists independently, but everything has come into existence through some cause other than itself. Consequently the universe itself, the sum of all these things, came into existence through some external cause. Therefore we require some cause to account for its existence, and this cause is God. He is the ultimate and supreme cause, because from Him all contingent beings, including such as are purely spiritual, derive their existence. He cannot be contingent, but must be necessary, since He has no cause, but exists independently.

1. There are only two possible explanations for the existence of anything that exists. Either it has in itself the reason of its being, i.e., it exists because its very nature requires existence, or the cause of its existence is outside of itself, i.e., it exists because it has been produced by something else. Now the nature of the universe does not necessarily require existence; the universe need not exist at all; therefore it must have been produced by something else. That the nature of the universe does not necessarily imply existence is plain from the fact that the universe is nothing but the aggregate or sum total of beings, each single one of which obviously is indifferent to existence; hence their sum total, i.e., the whole universe, is equally indifferent to existence. It follows that there must be some Being, external and superior to the universe, who brought it into existence.

2. A thing is called contingent or accidental (in the philosophical sense of the word) that might or might not exist or might exist in some other way. Everything in the world is

limited and conditioned according to time and place, size and form, properties and powers. It might not exist at all or might exist otherwise. If it exists in the form that it has, it does so in virtue, not of its own nature, but of some conditioning cause. Everything in the world is dependent and conditional, and consequently the world itself cannot be independent and self sufficing. Everything in the world is limited and finite, and consequently the world itself cannot be absolute and infinite.

3. The existence of the things in the universe cannot be accounted for by assuming that there is an infinite series of contingent causes. An infinite series with no beginning involves a contradiction.

Even if we granted the possibility of an infinite series of accidental causes, such a series would not account for the existence of the universe. For as each of these intermediate causes would be, by itself, insufficient to exist, the whole series would be insufficient and would require for its existence outside of itself a cause which is truly self-sufficient.

2. *From the movement in the world.* According to the law of inertia, matter is indifferent to rest and movement and is set in motion by an impulse it receives from without. Therefore all movement must proceed from some original motive power that is not itself set in motion; this power is God.

1. When we speak of motion we generally mean movement in space, but we may refer also to quantitative and qualitative motion, the interior and exterior changes that take place in things. "Everything that moves must be set in motion by something; hence there must somewhere be what is the first cause of motion." (*Aristotle,* Phys., I.)

2. Recent discoveries in physics, such as the law of the uniformity of nature's forces, the equilibrium of forces, and the law of entropy, have confirmed the argument derived from motion.

The various forces of nature (electricity, magnetism, heat, light, chemical and mechanical motion) can be transformed one into the other, thus proving that they are different states of the one fundamental force, i.e., motion. The course of the universe depends upon the mutual play of forces, but these forces tend towards an equilibrium or dead level, from which they cannot again raise themselves. All processes involve the production of

heat. Now it is possible for a force to be completely resolved into heat, but heat can be only partially resolved into force. The total energy of the universe remains constant, but the irreducible portion of heat is always increasing and tending towards a maximum (entropy). When this is reached and everything is of the same temperature, the end of the world is imminent. These physical considerations are arguments against the permanence of the universe and in favour of its having both a beginning and an end in time.

3. *From the organic life on our earth.* Life, whether animal or vegetable, cannot be produced by matter, but only by some higher, supramundane Creator.

Science has never discovered any transition from inorganic to organic matter. It is universally admitted that our earth was once so intensely hot that no organic life would have been possible. To suppose that meteorites conveyed the germs of life to the earth does not explain life, but is simply begging the question. "Spontaneous generation must be given up; under no circumstances whatever can chemical and mechanical forces produce a living being." (*Reinke*, professor of botany at Kiel, Die Welt als Tat., p. 315.) Whilst confessing that he wishes the evidence were the other way, *Tyndall* is compelled to say: "I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life." (Nineteenth Century, 1878.)

Even the writer of the Book of Wisdom (xiii, 1) bids us contemplate the universe, saying: "All men are vain in whom there is not the knowledge of God, and who, by these good things that are seen, could not understand Him that is, neither by attending to the works, have acknowledged who was the workman." *Cicero* makes a very similar remark: "Thou beholdest not God, yet thou knowest God from His works." (Tusc. disp., I, 29, 70.)

2. *The Teleological Proof*

The universe as a whole and all things belonging to it are arranged with wonderful order and design. The reason for this does not reside in the things themselves, for they are subordinate to this order. There

must, therefore, be an infinitely wise ruler superior to the universe, and this is God. The Ruler of the universe must be *one,* since the plan of the universe exhibits strict uniformity of design. The Ruler of the universe must be a personal, rational Being, because adaptation to an end supposes knowledge and choice of appropriate means. Only a thinking mind can know and elect.

1. All natural sciences reveal the order existing in the universe. *Astronomy* teaches us the laws governing the movements of the planets and their mutual attraction. *Physics and mechanics* teach us the laws of light, sound, heat, cold, gravitation, friction, and electricity. *Chemistry* explains the composition of substances, the relation of their elements, the laws of combination and analysis, crystallization, and material aggregation. *Botany* shows how the vegetable kingdom is divided according to the form, colour, smell, and taste of plants, and it investigates the laws governing their nutrition, growth, and propagation. *Zoölogy* deals with the various kinds of animals and their instincts and shows how the structure of their bodies corresponds with their mode of life. What we call the laws of nature is the order existing among things and perceived by the mind of man.

2. Adjustment to the end in view dominates every part of nature and connects the heavenly bodies with our earth. The sun regulates the earth's movement, and its light and heat are necessary to all organic life. The varying seasons and climates determine the conditions of life for animals and plants. In their composition, distribution, and properties air and water are destined to support life. The whole vegetable kingdom is ordered with reference to the animal kingdom, and this in its turn is admirably equipped to preserve, distribute, and propagate organic life. Every single plant in its structure and properties (root, stem, leaves, blossoms; water plants, creepers, parasites, carnivorous plants) is adapted with marvellous precision to its conditions of life. The body of each animal, with its framework of bones, its covering of hair or feathers, its organs of sensation and nutrition, and its means of locomotion, is perfectly adapted to its end.

The inexhaustible wealth of natural forms and their wonderful beauty reveal our Creator's goodness as well as His wisdom and are a source of pure delight and unfailing joy to every one

with a thoughtful mind and a feeling heart. "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands." (Ps. xviii, 2.)

Even *Cicero* arrives at a teleological conclusion: "When we look up at the sky, and contemplate the heavenly bodies, can anything be more plain and obvious than that there is some higher being of surpassing intelligence governing all these things? (de nat. deor., II, 2.) And elsewhere he writes: "If any one supposes that this most beautiful and glorious world was made by the accidental coming together of atoms, I do not understand why he should not suppose that the Annals of *Ennius* might be produced by pouring out on the earth the twenty-one letters of the alphabet in countless profusion." (de nat. deor., II, 37.)

3. Many things in nature appear aimless or even opposed to the end in view (waste of living germs, etc.), but this is true only of the proximate end. If we regard nature as a whole (inclusive of man), everything has its purpose. Much that seems to disturb the course of nature serves to warn man against pride and recklessness, to sharpen his intellect, to strengthen his will, and to give him an opportunity to practise patience, mercy, and charity.

3. *The Moral Proof*

Man, though conscious of possessing free will, is nevertheless aware that he is subject to a moral law, forbidding evil and commanding good. The inward voice of conscience admonishes him to obey this law. Conscience makes itself felt in every human being as soon as he attains to the use of reason; its verdict is independent of a man's own wishes and of the judgment of his fellowmen. It warns, admonishes, commends, and blames. It may be suppressed for a time, but will reawaken, for it can never be destroyed. Conscience cannot originate in man himself, since it asserts itself in opposition to his will. Consequently there must be some supreme Lawgiver, punishing evil and rewarding good, whose holy will is made known by the human conscience.

1. *Conscience is not a lawgiver itself,* as *Kant* believed, but it is the voice of the supreme Lawgiver. If man were autonomous, he would be able to alter the law that he had laid down and to dispense himself from its observance without any sense of guilt. But this is impossible for him.

2. *Conscience is not the result of education or environment.* In isolated instances it may be led astray by ignorance, want of training, and the influence of the passions, yet it makes itself felt in spite of all these things and can never be completely stifled.

3. Even the pagans recognized the voice of conscience (Erinyes and Eumenides), and *St. Paul* confirms this statement in Rom. ii, 14, 15: "For when the gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law; these having not the law, are a law to themselves: who shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing or also defending one another."

4. *The Historical Proof*

All nations in every age, both civilized and barbarous, agree in believing that there is a God (or gods). This consent of opinion is a proof that the fact of God's existence is indelibly impressed upon the mind of man. The voice of nature proclaims His existence, and this utterance must be true.

The universality of belief in one or more gods has been demonstrated above under the head of Universality of Religion.

The Creator of human nature gave it a religious bias as an inalienable possession, reminding man incessantly of his Maker. "What all men, impelled as it were by instinct, hold to be true, is a natural truth." (*Aristotle,* Rhet., I, 13.) Cf. *Cicero* (de nat. deor., I, 17): "An opinion which has in its favour the unanimous testimony of the human race cannot but be true."

Conclusions deduced from the proofs of God's existence. We deduce from these arguments a number of God's most important attributes as well as the fact of His existence. A purely rational consideration shows us that God is one, everlasting, almighty, all-

wise, all-good, and most holy. He created the universe and governs it; He directs man in accordance with His unchanging moral law. Man is bound to serve God and will find in this service happiness and peace of mind. All these truths form part of a natural knowledge of God.

Atheism

That God exists is a truth made known to us by reason; hence atheism is opposed to reason.

1. *Atheism does not satisfy the intellect;* it cannot refute the arguments in support of God's existence, nor can it adduce valid reasons for denying it. Thus it fails to beget in its adherents a firm conviction.

Lord *Bacon* of Verulam (1561–1626) writes: "A little or superficial knowledge of philosophy may incline the mind of man to atheism, but a farther proceeding therein doth bring the mind back again to religion." *Cicero* says of an Epicurean atheist: "I never knew any one who had so much fear of death and God, the two things that we are told not to fear at all; he is always speaking of them." (de nat. deor., I, 31.) "But, indeed, positive atheism, as a rational conviction, is impossible. It is absolutely impossible that any direct positive proof whatsoever should be brought against the existence of God." (*Kane,* God or Chaos.)

2. *Atheism does not satisfy the heart.* We are naturally impelled to seek lasting happiness, and our craving is never satisfied unless there is eternity with God. Thus atheism destroys all joy in life, all courage in misfortune, and all hope in death.

"No one is so completely alone," says *Jean Paul,* "as the man who denies God's existence. He mourns with the heart of an orphan, bereft of the greatest of fathers, beside the vast corpse of nature, in which no universal spirit lives and moves, and he continues to mourn until he himself drops off from this corpse."

3. *Atheism overthrows morality and authority,* the supports of human society. If it were universally accepted, it would inevitably bring about the destruction of the human race.

If there is no God there is no supreme Judge and no check upon immorality and vice. If there is no God there is no Lord and Master, *ni Dieu ni Maître,* and this involves anarchy, the overthrow of all civilization and of human society. Hence even pagan states upheld faith in the gods, for as *Homer* says (Od., III, 48): "All men have need of them."

Atheism originates either in pride of intellect or in perversity of the will.

1. Intellectual pride refuses to acknowledge any supernatural authority in spiritual matters and relies solely on individual investigation. The quest of knowledge apart from the practice of religion stunts man's religious tendency, narrows his intellectual horizon, makes him dwell upon isolated facts, and leads him to oblivion of God, who is the first cause of everything. As an individual an atheist who has received a Christian education and lived in Christian surroundings may remain morally good, for even an unbeliever is unconsciously influenced by his Christian environment.

2. A perverse will and an immoral and dissipated manner of life are a frequent source of unbelief. Hence we read in Holy Scripture: "The fool [Hebrew *nabhal,* lit. morally corrupt] hath said in his heart: 'There is no God.'" (Ps. xiii, 1.) *St. Augustine,* too, remarks: "Nobody denies God save one whose interest it is that there be no God." *La Bruyère* (who died in 1696) says: "I should like to find a sober, learned, self-controlled, and chaste man who denies the existence of God and the immortality of the soul; but such a person does not exist." *d'Alembert* writes: "A foolish desire not to think like other people, and to give free scope to the passions, has produced more unbelievers than all specious arguments put together." A modern writer on education says: "The slave of sinful habits is finally forced either to despair of God's mercy or to doubt God's existence. It is natural, moreover, that he should hate one whom he is compelled to fear, and resist one whom he dreads. During his lifetime *Voltaire* enjoyed himself and mocked at God; when he had to die he stormed and raved." (*Pesch, Lebensphiloso-*

phie, I a, 11.) Even *Rousseau* gave the following advice to a young friend: "My son, preserve thy soul always in such a state that it may wish that there were a God, and then thou wilt never question this truth." (Emile, IV.)

3. As man approaches maturity he feels most forcibly the power of his passions, and hence it is at this period of life that many lose their faith. No one becomes an unbeliever at a more advanced age; in fact many who have lost their faith when young recover it later. (*Buffon, La Harpe, Montesquieu, Daumer, Coppée,* etc.)

The adherents of atheism have never been very numerous, and in every age the noblest and most intellectual men have invariably believed in God.

1. Some people, especially some young men, call themselves atheists, whereas they are only indifferent to their religious duties and practices rather than actual unbelievers. If they fall under the influence of an atheistical person or book (*Büchner, Vogt, Haeckel, Ingersoll*), they may for a time lose all faith in God, but it revives as soon as a contrary influence is brought to bear upon them or any misfortune overtakes them.

Socialists generally profess atheism because believers in God, who hope for a just reward in the world to come and who regard rulers as God's representatives, refuse to adopt their views. Many socialists, though otherwise well educated, know practically nothing of Christianity. Among learned men most of the professed atheists are either students of natural science or philosophers. Concentration of mind upon matter diminishes their appreciation of what is spiritual and moral in life, and especially of God, the supreme Spirit. Yet even among scientists the great majority are believers. *Kneller* has enumerated more than one hundred and sixty scientists in the nineteenth century who were sincere believers. (See *A. Kneller,* Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science.)

2. In every age innumerable princes, statesmen, artists, poets, soldiers, inventors, and scholars have believed in God. Among astronomers may be mentioned *Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Herschel, Euler, Secchi, Mädler, Heis,* and *Galle.* Among scientists and philosophers: *Bacon, Descartes, Leibniz, Wolf, Ampère, Volta, Newton, Kant, Faraday, Liebig, Linnaeus, Cuvier, O. Fraas, Joh. Müller, Ohm, Rob. von Mayer, Helmholtz, Siemens, Pasteur, E. V. Baer, J. Ranke, Becquerel,* Lord *Kelvin,* and many others. *Ozanam* says of *Ampère* that on one occasion he raised

both his hands to his head, exclaiming: "How great God is, *Ozanam,* and what a mere nothing is all our knowledge!" Even *Darwin,* whose works are often quoted by unbelievers in support of their views, confesses: "The question whether a Creator of the universe exists has been answered in the affirmative by the greatest thinkers who have ever lived."

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF GOD

Our Knowledge of God

BY means of the arguments for God's existence we learn something about God's nature and attributes, but revelation enables us to know Him more perfectly.

Our initial knowledge of God may be increased by reflection in three ways:

(*a*) By applying the principle of causality we argue thus: Whatever perfection exists in creatures must necessarily exist also in God, who is its cause. Thus He possesses wisdom, goodness, justice, etc.

(*b*) By elimination. Whatever imperfection exists in creatures must not be attributed to God, e.g., finiteness, dependence, existence in time, etc.

(*c*) By analogy. Whatever perfection exists in creatures must exist in God in an infinite degree, whatever good in us is contaminated with evil, in Him is pure and free from all alloy.

God is an absolute, infinitely perfect, and simple Spirit.

God is a Spirit, pure and personal.

God is a *pure* Spirit, i.e., He is nothing but spirit, immaterial, with no body.

God is a *personal* Spirit, i.e., He is a living, intellectual Spirit, thinking and possessing consciousness, existing of Himself, and free to will and to act.

God is not a mere abstraction, nor is He the impersonal soul of the universe, inseparable from the universe and devoid of self-consciousness and freedom.

As revelation teaches, there are three Persons in God, so that He possesses the perfection of personality in a mystical fulness.

That God is a Spirit possessing personality may be inferred especially from the teleological and moral argument. "God is a Spirit," says our Lord, "and they that adore Him, must adore Him in spirit and in truth." (John iv, 24.) There is no contradiction involved in passages of Holy Scripture where, for the sake of vividness, He is said to have a mouth, eyes, ears, and hands. (Anthropomorphism.)

God is an *absolute* Spirit, i.e., He is not dependent upon any other being; He has no cause, but exists of Himself (aseity). God is Being.

God is an infinitely *perfect* Spirit, i.e., in Him are summed up all good qualities in an infinite degree. Creatures, on the contrary, possess only certain perfections, and these only in a limited degree.

As God is Being itself He must possess Being in all its fulness, i.e., the fulness of all perfections.

God is a *simple* Spirit, i.e., He is absolutely simple. In His divine nature there is therefore (*a*) no composition of various parts, for only what is material has parts, and God is immaterial; (*b*) no combination of being and attributes, such as exists in creatures. The divine nature is one and the same as its attributes. God *is* what He *has,* i.e., He *is* wisdom, justice, etc.

Una est Dei substantia, simplex omnino. This statement was made by the Fourth Lateran Council. Every complex being attains its perfection through composition, e.g., the human soul is perfected by means of the qualities that it acquires. But God's nature is absolutely identical with its attributes. In Him there is no distinction between potentiality and actuality, i.e., between what might be and what is, nor is there any difference between existence and essence.

Deductions from these considerations:

1. *God is incomprehensible.* As His nature is infinitely perfect it cannot be comprehended by any finite intellect. God alone can comprehend Himself.

"The things that are of God no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God." (2 Cor. ii, 11.) "We know in part and we prophesy in part." (1 Cor. xiii, 9.) "It is impossible thoroughly to grasp and comprehend God; for couldst thou comprehend Him, He would not be God." (*St. Augustine,* Serm. 41. de V. D.) Still our knowledge of God, limited as it is, is a true knowledge, just as the scientific discoveries made by man are imperfect and yet real.

2. *God is ineffable.* As the mind of man is incapable of fully comprehending God's infinity, so is it incapable of devising a name to express His greatness.

"God is ineffable," says *St. Augustine* in commenting upon Ps. lxxxv, "and it is easier for us to state what He is not than what He is." The Fourth Lateran Council (cap. 1) described God as *incomprehensibilis et ineffabilis.*

3. All names for God are inadequate, since they designate one aspect only of His divine Being. The most sacred and significant name is Jahve (= being). When Moses asked God to tell him His name, God replied: "I am who am. Thou shalt say to the children of Israel: 'He who is hath sent me to you.'" (Exod. iii, 14.)

The Jews never utter the name Jahve, but substitute Adonai for it. In the Hebrew they write the consonants of Jahve and the vowels of Adonai, thus producing the word Jehovah. Other names for God in the Old Testament are Elohim, which suggests His supreme and terrible majesty; Adonai, which is translated Lord; and El Shaddai, which signifies the Strong, the Almighty. The Greek *θεός* is derived either from *θέσασθαι*, to be supplicated, so that *θεός* means He who is supplicated, or from *τίθημι*, I place, in which case *θεός* = He who places or orders all things. Others

derive it from θεασμαι, I behold, θεός = He who beholds all things, or from θέω, I run, θεός = He who penetrates everywhere.

The Latin deus comes from a Sanskrit root *div* and means bright. (Cf. Ζεύς Aeol. Δεύς, Jupiter = Diupiter, Divpater, the bright Father.) The German Gott and the English God are by some scholars derived from the Zend quadata, abbreviated to Khoda = the uncreated, the one who is; by others from the Sanskrit Khut = the Creator of the universe; by others from the Gothic guda = the ordering and directing force, He who arranges all things.

The Attributes of God

God's attributes are the perfections of the divine essence. Though these perfections are in reality identical with the divine essence, our limited mind conceives them as proceeding from and determining the latter, just as we conceive the qualities of finite things.

We may divide God's attributes into those belonging to His divine being, those belonging to His divine knowledge, and those belonging to His divine will.

The attributes of His divine being or existence are *eternity, immutability, immensity,* and *ubiquity.*

1. When we say that God is *eternal,* we mean that He has always existed, without beginning and without end.

God's existence is a perpetual *now,* not, like ours, a series of consecutive states. God possesses His interminable life always and all at once. "Before Abraham was made, I am." (John viii, 58.)

2. When we say that God is *immutable,* we mean that He is always the same and never alters His decrees.

"With God there is no change nor shadow of alteration." (James i, 17.) Every change involves either increase or diminution, but God is absolute perfection, therefore no perfection can be lacking nor can any be added to Him.

3. When we say that God is *immense* or immeasurable, we mean that He has no limitations in space; He does not merely exist in and with the universe, but also beyond and above it.

Hence *Solomon* said at the dedication of the Temple: "If heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee, how much less this house which I have built!" (3 Kings viii, 27.)

4. When we say that God is *omnipresent,* we mean that He is everywhere, in heaven, on earth, and in every place.

"God is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live and move and be." (Acts xvii, 27, 28.)

God is present in a threefold manner: (*a*) in His *essence,* since He pervades every part of the universe, just as our soul permeates our whole body; (*b*) in His *knowledge,* since "all things are naked and open to His eyes" (Hebr. iv, 13), in the same way as what we see with our eyes is present to us; (*c*) in His *power,* since everything is subject to His dominion. Because God displays His activity particularly in certain places we speak of Him as present there in a special manner; thus we say that God abides in heaven, in the Church, and in the souls of the righteous.

The attributes of God's knowledge are *omniscience* and *wisdom.*

1. God is *omniscient,* i.e., He knows everything perfectly and has known it for all eternity; He knows the past, the present, and the future, and also our most secret thoughts.

The object of knowledge is truth; therefore God knows Himself as infinite truth, and He is happy in this knowledge. Moreover, He knows all else that is true, whether it be past, present, or future, actual or possible. "All things were known to the Lord God before they were created." (Ecclus. xxiii, 29.)

2. God is *all-wise,* i.e., He knows how to dispose everything so as best to accomplish what He wills.

"How great are thy works, O Lord! Thou hast made all things in wisdom." (Ps. ciii, 24.)

The attributes of God's will are *omnipotence, freedom, sanctity, justice, goodness, mercy, patience, sincerity,* and *fidelity.*

1. God is *almighty,* i.e., He can accomplish whatever He wishes by a mere act of His will.

"No word shall be impossible with God." (Luke i, 37.) In the case of man, to will and to accomplish are different things; in the case of God, they are identical.

2. God is *free,* i.e., He is exempt from any constraint compelling Him to exercise His power.

God's freedom is a consequence of His infinite perfection, which requires nothing beyond itself. Hence the creation of the universe, and of this particular universe, was a free act on the part of God. Man can choose good or evil, but this is a want of true freedom, because evil is a misfortune to him and carries him away from his goal. The more firmly he clings to good, the greater is his liberty. God cannot will evil, because He is perfectly free.

3. God is *holy,* i.e., He loves and wills good, because it harmonizes with His own perfections, and He detests evil.

"Thou hast loved justice and hated iniquity." (Ps. xliv, 8.) "One is good, God." (Matth. xix, 17.) God's sanctity consists in His loving Himself as the highest good and all else only for His own sake. Hence the sanctity of creatures consists in loving God above all things and all else for His sake only.

4. God is *just,* i.e., He rewards good and punishes evil according to merit.

It is in eternity and not on earth that perfect retribution will be made. Consequently the wicked often prosper here below, whilst the good are unhappy. Yet even in this life no godless man is truly happy and no just person truly wretched, for the wicked never possess inward peace, and the service of their

passions requires greater exertions than the service of God, whereas the righteous enjoy peace with God and have an easy conscience.

5. God is *good and kind,* i.e., He loves His creatures and bestows on them countless benefits.

The chief proof of God's infinite goodness and love is the fact that He allowed His own Son to die in order to redeem us from our sins. "Thou lovest all things that are, and hatest none of the things which Thou hast made." (Wisd. xi, 25.)

6. God is *merciful,* i.e., He is inclined to avert evil from His creatures, and delights in forgiving all penitent sinners.

"As I live, saith the Lord God, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live." (Ezech. xxxiii, 11.)

7. God is *patient,* i.e., He often waits a long time before punishing sinners, so as to give them time for repentance.

"The Lord . . . dealeth patiently for your sake, not willing that any should perish, but that all should return to penance." (2 Peter iii, 9.)

8. God is *sincere and true,* i.e., He reveals nothing but the truth, because He can neither err nor deceive.

Being omniscient He cannot fall into error, and being holy He cannot deceive. "It is impossible for God to lie." (Hebr. vi, 18.)

9. God is *faithful,* i.e., He keeps His promises and fulfils His threats.

God's fidelity is a consequence of His sincerity, His words are the expression of His will, and His will is unchangeable.

Practical conclusions. The consideration of God's attributes should spur us to do right and to shun evil.

1. God's eternity and unchangeableness ought to

make us turn our hearts to the eternal good and detach them from the perishable things of this world.

2. God's omnipresence and omniscience ought to keep us from secret sins and comfort us in affliction.

3. God's omnipotence and wisdom ought to encourage us to trust in Him and accept what He sends us.

4. God's sanctity and justice ought to stimulate us in our efforts to become holy and not to rely on our own paltry righteousness.

5. God's goodness and mercy should make us thankful towards Him and inspire us with confidence when we have the misfortune of falling into sin. They should also make us kind and merciful towards others.

6. God's sincerity and fidelity bind us to believe His word and trust His promises, and always to speak the truth and keep our word.

The Unity of God

The divine Being is *one,* one single God. Monotheism is the religion that recognizes God as One. That there is one God appears:

1. From the uniformity in the order and government of the universe. In it we can trace one fundamental design, one organizing will and intelligence, and one directing force.

According to *Socrates,* there can be only one God, because He has arranged the universe so as to form one great whole. He is supreme wisdom, hidden, it is true, from our senses, but revealing Himself in the order existing in nature. (*Xenophon,* Memorab., I, 1, 4, 6; IV, 3, 14.)

"Overwhelming proofs of intelligence and benevolent design lie around us; showing to use through nature the influence of a free-will, and teaching us that all living beings depend upon one ever-acting Creator and Ruler." (Lord *Kelvin,* Presidential Address to British Association, 1882.)

2. From the idea of God as the most perfect being. There cannot be two absolutely perfect beings, because one would limit the other and neither would possess absolute perfection.

3. From the tradition of the human race. The biblical account of the creation, which contains the earliest history of man, shows monotheism to have been the original religion. A tendency to polytheism developed later. (Gen. xxiv, 3, etc.; xxxi, 19, 30, 34.) The further back we trace the history of religion, the purer is the conception of God among pagan nations and the more does their religion approach monotheism. (Cf. page 11.)

The unity of God forms the basis of revelation in both the Old and the New Testament. It is proclaimed at the beginning of the decalogue and of the Apostles' Creed, and finds expression in innumerable passages of Holy Scripture.

On Sinai God said to the Israelites: "I am the Lord thy God, . . . thou shalt not have strange gods before me" (Exod. xx, 2, 3); and through the prophet *Isaias* He said: "I am God, and there is no God beside, neither is there the like to me" (Is. xlvi, 9). *St. Paul* writes: "We know that . . . there is no God but one." (1 Cor. viii, 4.)

Polytheism

Polytheism is the worship of many gods. It is a debased form of the original religion of mankind. It originated chiefly in human depravity, which obscures the intellect, corrupts the idea of God, and leads to spiritual degradation.

St. Paul describes the growth of paganism as follows: Men are inexcusable, because, when they knew God, they have not glorified Him as God, or given thanks, but became vain in their

thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts and of creeping things . . . they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator. (Rom. i, 20–25.)

The growth of polytheism was assisted by

(*a*) *Nature worship.* As soon as man formed a material conception of God he sought Him in nature and in things perceptible to the senses.

All the phenomena of nature, whether useful or injurious, whether terrible, attractive, or majestic, came to be regarded as symbols of deities and subsequently as deities themselves. Thus man adored as gods the sky, the earth, the sun, the other heavenly bodies, fire, water, thunder, and many animals.

(*b*) *Apotheosis.* Prominent men were deified, and this gave rise to the worship of ancestors and heroes.

(*c*) *Personification.* Especially among the Romans ethical and aesthetic concepts were personified as gods (Mars, Mercurius, Fortuna, Justitia, etc.).

(*d*) *Mythology.* The number of the gods was amplified by traditions, poetry, and art.

The lowest stage of polytheism is represented by *idolatry,* i.e., the worship of some picture or figure of a god; *fetishism,* the worship of some irrational object, such as a stone, a plant, or an animal; and *totemism,* the worship of some particular kind of plant or animal.

The human race never completely lost the consciousness of the unity of God.

(*a*) Among the classical nations of antiquity the belief in one God was never totally eclipsed by polytheism.

Xenophon describes Zeus as "of all the gods the one who orders and sustains the whole universe." (Memorab., IV, 3, 13.)

Varro says: "Jupiter the almighty, the father of kings and of all things and of the gods and goddesses, the one sole God." (Ap. Aug. de civit. Dei, VII, 9.) *Horace,* in speaking of Jupiter, says: "He alone rules the sluggish earth and stormy sea, cities and the regions of the dead, gods and mortals alike with his impartial sway." (Carm., III, 4, 45.)

(*b*) Under the influence of a strong emotion pagans used language expressive of a belief in one God.

"Do you require us to prove from the testimony of your own feeling that there is but one God? You yourselves, though hemmed in and bound by your evil institutions and weakened by your passions, and though in slavish bondage to false gods, if ever you assert your liberty, speak of God, and you use the name of the one true God, you say: 'The great God,' 'the good God,' 'God grant it,'—such expressions are on the lips of all. You even testify that God is your judge, for you say: 'God knows,' 'God requite it.' How wonderful is the testimony of the soul that is by nature Christian!" (*Tertullian,* Apolog., c. 17.)

"The very worshippers of the gods, when they swear, or utter prayers and thanksgivings, do not mention Jupiter or many gods, but simply God." (*Lactantius,* div. instit., II, 1.)

(*c*) Pagan philosophers clearly recognized and expressed the fact that there is only one God.

According to *Plato,* God is the supreme good and the supreme Spirit, the source of all goodness and beauty. (Soph., p. 248, 265; de leg., X, 892, 898.) According to *Aristotle,* God is the principal or source of all life, *one* both in nature and in number. (Metaphys., XII, 8, 10.) (Cf. the quotation from *Xenophon,* page 34.)

CHAPTER IV

GOD'S WORK

I. CREATION, PRESERVATION, AND GOVERNMENT OF THE UNIVERSE

The Creation of the World

THE world was created, i.e., called into existence by God. The fact of creation lies beyond the scope of human experience, but is made known to us by our reason and confirmed by revelation.

The cosmological argument for the existence of God proves also the necessity of a Creator.

(*a*) The idea "created out of nothing" expresses, negatively, that before the creation neither the universe itself existed nor any matter from which it was formed or out of which it evolved. It expresses, positively, that the universe owes its existence to the will of God and to nothing else.

(*b*) The universe does not exist of itself, nor has it existed from all eternity, for then it would be necessary and imperishable, whereas it is really contingent and perishable.

The universe did not come into being of itself in time, for then the effect would be antecedent to the cause. What does not yet exist cannot be in a state of activity. Therefore it must have been called into existence by a cause other than itself.

(*c*) The Persians, some Greek philosophers, such as *Plato*, and many of the Gnostics taught the existence of some indestructible matter (chaos, hyle), and the Manichaeans believed this matter to be the source and abode of all evil (dualism). If, however, there were any primitive matter eternal and independent of God, it would be a limitation of His absolute Being, and this is impossible.

We learn from Holy Scripture that God created the world out of nothing: "In the beginning God created

heaven and earth." (Gen. i, 1.) The mother of the Machabees said to her youngest son: "I beseech thee, my son, look upon heaven and earth, and all that is in them, and consider that God made them out of nothing, and mankind also." (2 Mach. vii, 28.) In the New Testament *St. Paul* says: "Every house is built by some man, but He that created all things is God." (Hebr. iii, 4.)

The words "heaven and earth" in Holy Scripture mean things visible and invisible. "Heaven," when used alone, means the air, the firmament, and the abode of bliss.

The Hebrew expression barâ, created, is used in the Bible only to describe God's production of the universe out of nothing. *St. Augustine* states the Christian tradition: "The Catholic faith requires us to say that the Triune God made and created all that exists, so that every being, rational or corporeal, was produced, not from God's essence (pantheism), but by God out of nothing. (de Gen. imperf., c. 1.) The Church recorded this belief at the Fourth Lateran Council: "We firmly believe . . . that there is only one true God, creator of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible, who by His almighty power at the beginning of time produced out of nothing creatures of two kinds, viz., spiritual and corporal, the angels and the universe, and then created man, so as to have something in common with both, since man consists of spirit and body." (Conc. Lat. IV, cap. Firmiter.)

Materialism and Pantheism

Materialism and pantheism are opposed to the Christian doctrine of creation; both systems deny the existence of God as the Creator distinct from the universe. *Materialism* regards the universe and all its phenomena as an evolution of matter. *Pantheism* regards the universe and all its phenomena as the evolution of an impersonal Absolute.

Materialism does not differ essentially from pantheism; both are forms of atheism. Ostensibly pantheism makes the first

cause of the universe antecedent to matter and regards the latter as a development of the Absolute, which it calls God. But as this starting-point is neither personal nor spiritual, nor in fact anything apart from the universe, the Absolute is the material universe itself, conceived of at an earlier stage. Thus pantheism is merely a disguised form of materialism. "Pantheism is a theory that annihilates itself, for the very idea of God postulates as its correlative a universe distinct from God. If the universe is to play the part of God, we have an absolute universe without God, and therefore pantheism is nothing but a euphemism for atheism." (*Schopenhauer,* Parerga, I, 123.)

In recent years these theories of the universe have been called *monism,* because they profess to account for everything in the world by referring it to one single cause (μόνος, single).

The attempt to trace back the multiplicity of phenomena to one ultimate cause is in itself reasonable. But neither materialism nor pantheism is able to give an explanation of the universe that satisfies the demands of reason. The doctrine of creation, which demands a personal God as the one sole cause of all existence, supplies the only satisfactory way of accounting for the universe.

1. *Materialism*

Essence of materialism. The three chief tenets of materialism are:

(*a*) Matter is self-existing and consists of atoms endowed with motion.

(*b*) Nothing besides matter has any existence at all; hence there can be no spirit.

(*c*) Everything has necessarily developed from matter.

1. The coarse materialism of such men as *Büchner* and *Vogt* denies that there is any distinction between spiritual and material motion. It regards thought and volition as mechanical activity of the brain. Modern materialists, however, admit the difference between spiritual and material motion, but claim that intellectual as well as mechanical forces have been present in

matter from the beginning; and whenever certain conditions arise, these intellectual forces become free to act. Mind is, they say, the blossom of matter.

2. *History of materialism. Thales, Anaximenes,* and *Anaximander,* old Ionic philosophers, were materialists when they taught that everything originated in matter, air, water, or something similar. The system of natural philosophy propounded by *Democritus* (born 460 B.C.) is likewise materialistic.

Epicurus (born 342 B.C.) adopted the views of *Democritus* and developed them practically in his theory of hedonism. *Lucretius* (99–55 B.C.) gave them poetical expression in his "De rerum natura." Some of the later humanists, such as *Ulrich von Hutten,* took a very materialistic view of the universe, and *Diderot, d'Alembert,* and others represent French materialism. About the middle of the nineteenth century socialistic materialism was represented by *Ludwig, Feuerbach, Karl Vogt, Moleschott,* and *Büchner,* and at the present time *Haeckel, Klaatch,* and others profess biogenetic monism. *Positivism* and *agnosticism* may be regarded as materialistic systems, since they regard sense experience as the only source of knowledge.

Criticism of materialism. Materialism is inadequate to account for the universe. Its principles offer no explanation of the existence of matter itself, life and intellectual activity, nor of the order of the universe.

1. Materialism declares matter to be eternal. It cannot explain how what is contingent, conditional, and limited in matter can at the same time be eternal and necessary.

Materialism maintains that atoms are endowed with motion (force). It fails to explain how motion is imparted to inert matter. "As Lord *Grimthorpe* says, it is no explanation to call the laws inherent, for this word only means sticking-in, and this does not tell us how they got there." (*J. Gerard,* A Course of Religious Instruction.)

Materialism cannot even prove that matter consists of atoms. If nothing exists which cannot be perceived by means of the senses, then atoms cannot be proved to have any existence, since they cannot be thus perceived.

2. Materialism asserts that there is no independent, spiritual being (i.e., that there is no God, no pure spirit, and no soul). It is unable to explain how matter can live, feel, think, and will.

3. Materialism believes that everything has evolved from matter. It cannot explain how indefinite, confused, lifeless atoms could have given rise to definite things, an orderly universe, to vegetable, animal, and human life.

The consequences of materialism are terrible; it reduces man to a piece of mechanism, devoid of will and reason, and lower than the beasts. It denies the personal freedom and consequently the responsibility of the individual. In materialism there is no place for morality and justice, and the words reward and punishment, virtue and vice, have no meaning, for the whole universe is nothing but "a whirling dance of atoms."

"This doctrine [materialism] unintentionally implants in man an abject kind of resignation, and if it ever became predominant, it must inevitably bring about a complete physical and moral stagnation in the human race. For who would exert himself in any way, who would toil and struggle, if the destinies of men were fulfilled with monotonous, mechanical regularity and with the same inexorable constancy as that with which the planets rise and set?" (*Joh. Scherr.*)

"Materialism is the religion of the demoralized masses and of voluptuaries; want and misery have caused the former to adopt this melancholy creed, and the latter discover in it an excuse for their mode of life." (*Schanz,* A Christian Apology, vol. I.)

2. *Pantheism*

Nature of Pantheism. Pantheism identifies the universe with God, since it regards Him as immanent in the world, or the world as immanent in Him.

Its chief forms are:

(*a*) *Emanationism,* according to which everything emanates from God as the origin of all existence, just as a ray proceeds from a candle, or a stream from its source.

(*b*) *Phenomenalism,* according to which God is the

universal soul resident in matter, that reveals itself in the phenomena of the universe. Everything is a phenomenon or made of manifestation of the deity, just as a wave is a phenomenon of water, and the wind of air.

(*c*) *Idealistic pantheism,* according to which God is a vague, abstract being which attains to definite concrete existence in individual things, as the idea of running is realized in one who runs.

History of pantheism. Like materialism, pantheism is one of the earliest aberrations of human thought. *Emanationism* may be discovered in the works of Hindoo philosophers and in the doctrines of the Neo-Platonic and Gnostic schools, as well as among the Arabs. *Phenomenalism* was taught by the Pythagoreans and Stoics, who gave it the name of *hylozoism* (the living force underlying matter). Later adherents of it were *Giordano Bruno* (died 1600), *Spinoza* (died 1666), *Fichte* (died 1814), *Hegel* (died 1831), and *Schelling* (died 1834). Neither England, France, nor America has produced a single great pantheistic philosopher, but there is a vast amount of pantheistic sentiment floating about in the poetry of these countries (*Shelley, Emerson*).

Criticism of pantheism. In all its forms pantheism is contrary to reason and leads to insoluble contradictions in the natural and moral order.

(*a*) *Pantheism is opposed to reason.* It is impossible for the world to be a phase or phenomenon of the divine substance as emanationism and phenomenalism would have it. The cause of the universe is necessary and absolute and cannot be liable to change; hence it is neither capable, nor in need, of evolution.

The cause of the universe cannot be a void, indefinite being, for if nothing else existed to give an impulse to its evolution, it would have continued for ever to be void and indefinite. "On my devious path I encountered the god of pantheism and could make nothing of him. This miserable, fantastic being is inextricably interwoven with the universe and appears devoid of will and power. Only a person can have a will, and in order to manifest this will, he must have power to execute." (*Heine.*)

(*b*) *Pantheism leads to insoluble contradictions in the natural order* by identifying the things in the universe with the absolute

cause of its existence. The things are finite, temporary, and changeable; the cause is infinite, eternal, and unchanging. According to pantheism, the infinite is at the same time finite, the eternal exists in time, the unchanging is changeable.

(*c*) *Pantheism leads to insoluble contradictions in the moral order* by identifying God with man. The actions of man would thus be those of the Absolute, and the pantheistic god would act reasonably in one individual, foolishly in another, virtuously in a third, and wickedly in a fourth. Even in one and the same person he would act now in accordance with, now in opposition to reason, now morally, now immorally.

Pantheism has disastrous consequences, for it destroys religion; it reduces worship of God to worship of self; and by annihilating free will it overthrows all morality and justice. In pantheism all actions are divine and consequently good and just. There can be no sin, no crime, and no right to punish.

(*a*) "All pantheism must ultimately give way before the irresistible demands of ethics. If the universe is a theophany, everything done by any man or animal is alike divine and excellent, nothing can be blamed or regarded as better than anything else; thus no ethics can exist." (*Schopenhauer,* The World as Will and Idea.)

(*b*) Pantheism commends itself to those unpractised in or incapable of logical thought, who allow themselves to be carried away by their imagination. Hence people of poetical tendencies and a few religious mystics have used pantheistic expressions. Pantheism is an attractive error, for it possesses a kind of majesty and poetical beauty that impress men with their charm. Its religious tinge is also apt to mislead, for a pantheist not only speaks of God, but of community with God, absorption in God, etc., though he gives a false meaning to the words. Pantheism does harm chiefly by its moral principles: "There is no sin," "All is good." It echoes the voice of the tempter in Paradise: Ye shall be as gods.

At the Vatican Council the Church therefore rightly condemned pantheism as a pernicious error.

"If any man asserts that God and all things are essentially one and the same, let him be anathema. If any man asserts

that corporeal and spiritual things are emanations of the divine substance, or that the divine substance becomes everything by means of manifesting or evolving itself, or, finally, that God is the indeterminate existence, determining itself and producing all the various genera, species, and individuals, let him be anathema." (Const. I in c. 1, can. 3 et 4.)

The riddle of the universe. This expression designates a number of fundamental questions regarding the origin of the world. In the course of a lecture given on July 8, 1880, at the Berlin Academy of Science, Professor *Dubois-Reymond* applied it to the seven following questions: 1. What is force? 2. What is matter? 3. Whence does motion proceed? 4. What causes sense perception? 5. What produces thought and speech? 6. What adapts things to the end that they have to serve? 7. Is there such a thing as free will? The lecturer pronounced the first four questions to be unanswerable from the point of view of natural science: *Ignoramus et ignorabimus;* the last three, he said, had never yet been answered, but it was possible for an answer to be given: *Ignoramus.* This lecture attracted much attention and caused a lively discussion, as a result of which the expression "riddle of the universe" came to be used technically in scientific literature. (See *J. Gerard,* S.J., The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer.)

E. Haeckel, professor at Jena, has published a popular treatise with the title "The Riddle of the Universe" and the subordinate title "A Popular Study of Monistic Philosophy." This work has been translated into several foreign languages, and an enormous number of copies of a cheap German edition have been sold. With regard to the seven questions mentioned above, *Haeckel* claims to have answered three by his idea of substance, three more have been finally disposed of by the modern theory of evolution, whilst the seventh — the question of free will — is, he says, "a dogma based on error, having really no existence at all." *Haeckel's* book has been condemned as utterly unscientific by all scientific critics, but it was welcomed with enthusiasm as the "Gospel of Monism" by socialistic atheists and popular leaders of free thought. Dr. *O. Külpe* of Würzburg writes as follows on the subject: "The book may be compared with *Büchner's* 'Force and Matter'; it displays the same scientific pretensions, the same hostile attitude towards traditional and prevalent philosophical tendencies, the same unpardonable ignorance in matters of history, philosophy, religion, and the Church, and the same absence of any good intention to judge these matters dispassionately and fairly." The work reveals,

moreover, the same confusion of thought, inability to distinguish monism and materialism, or to recognize and explain the difficulties and problems peculiar to the subject. It is easy to understand why *Paulsen* says: "I read the book with feelings of profound shame at the general state of education and philosophic thought among the German nation. It is painful to realize that such a book could have been written, printed, bought, read, admired, and believed in a country possessing such authors as *Kant, Goethe,* and *Schopenhauer.* But it is a fact that every nation and every age possess the literature that they deserve. Let us console ourselves with the thought that at the present day the undiscerning multitude are enthusiastic admirers of *Haeckel,* whereas yesterday perhaps they raved about *Nietzsche* and the day before swore by *Schopenhauer.* The judgment of the rabble has not much weight, and their applause has at all times tended to make the philosopher, on whom it is bestowed, an object of suspicion." (The Philosophy of our Age.)

O. D. Chwolson, a Russian scientist, has examined "The Riddle of the Universe" as far as it affects his department of study and expresses his opinion of it as follows: "The result of our examination is horrible, I may even say appalling. Everything that *Haeckel* says by way of explanation or demonstration, when dealing with questions of physics, is false, is based upon misconceptions, and betrays almost incredible ignorance of the most elementary facts. He has not the most elementary knowledge, such as a schoolboy might possess, even of the law that he proclaims to be the guiding star of his philosophy. Starting with such total ignorance, he thinks it possible to declare untenable the kinetic theory of substance, the foundation of modern physics, and to assert that the law of entropy, the second great principle of thermodynamics and one of the most splendid achievements of the human intellect, must be abandoned. . . . What is the result? What is the secret of his success, that will no doubt long continue, and will be checked least of all by a serious scientific study? This is a subject on which an interesting book might be written. . . . I should have to allude to many things in that book: to the degree of education now possessed by the majority of more or less educated people; to the great questions that now engage the attention of thoughtful individuals; to the destruction of the old deities, the overthrow of their altars, and the terrible desolation that has taken their place; to the ardent desire to fill this void with ghosts, with schemes, with vain words, with anything, in short, that may remove this oppressive sense of emptiness; to the psychology of the masses and to the

impression invariably made by bold, self-conscious, and incisive language; to the low degree of scientific training and, resulting from it, the absence of keen discernment; and to many other fine and interesting things." (Hegel, Haeckel, Kossuth, and the Twelfth Commandment.)

The Hexahemeron

God did not only create the universe, but He also perfected it, and this work of perfection was accomplished in six "days." (Hexahemeron.)

1. The creation was a single act of God's will. In the account given in Holy Scripture we read of a threefold division: (*a*) between light and darkness, (*b*) between air and water, (*c*) between land and water. Thereupon followed a threefold adornment of the universe: (*a*) lights in the firmament of heaven, (*b*) living creatures in air and water, and (*c*) living creatures and finally man upon the earth.

In the structure of this account there is nothing contrary to the natural order; the living creatures made their appearance successively when conditions admitted of their existence. Among many nations there is a tradition of successive acts of creation that bears a striking resemblance to the biblical account. (Cf. page 65.)

2. By "days" we need not understand solar days, since the sun was not created in the heavens until the fourth day; and the seventh day, when God rested, is not yet at an end. There is nothing to prevent our believing the "days" of creation to have been periods of thousands or even millions of years, and we may also assume that the various epochs of evolution, occurring in accordance with God's design, to some extent overlap one another.

The primary object of the biblical account of creation was to teach mankind certain religious and moral truths; the most important of which are (1) that God is the Creator of all things, (2) that God is a personal Spirit, (3) that creation is the outcome of God's goodness, (4) that man was created directly by God and consists of body and soul, (5) that God desires men to observe one day in seven as a holy day of rest.

Several important natural truths are connected with the above, e.g., that God is the Creator of matter and its forces, of the universe and its laws; that He is the author of life, and that the division of living creatures into genera and species was His design at their creation. Holy Scripture is not intended to teach natural science or any other form of science. In stating divinely revealed truths it makes use of language intelligible to men living at the time when it was written; and we must regard the expressions employed, not as technical or scientific, but rather as popular and as belonging to the ordinary language of the period. The revelation made in Holy Scripture has therefore nothing whatever to do with science. In expounding the statements made in the Bible, commentators have, of course, been guided by the scientific knowledge of the age in which they lived. "As long, then, as this universe endures, and our present knowledge of the physical sciences remains, the phenomena recorded in the first chapter of Genesis are everlasting witnesses to inspiration." (*John Smyth,* Genesis and Science.)

In different periods different interpretations have been given of the details of the biblical account of the creation. No real discrepancy can exist between the Bible and natural science, since both are the revelation of the same eternal truth.

Regarding the interpretation of the biblical account of the creation there are three theories:

1. *The purely historical theory.* The earlier commentators as a rule adhered to the literal interpretation as long as there was no scientific reason for departing from it.

2. *The theory of concordance.* After *Kant* and *Laplace* had put forward their hypothesis and scientific geology and palaeontology had developed, many commentators identified the successive days of creation with the corresponding periods of geology, attempting to make the details agree as much as possible.

3. *The theory of visions.* According to this theory the six days of creation bear no reference to time, but are six visions or pictures in which God communicated to the first man His chief ideas realized at the creation. *St. Augustine* enunciated this theory, basing it on the fact that God revealed to Adam by means of a vision the manner in which Eve was formed from his rib. The Church has expressed no opinion on the subject of any of these theories.

The story of creation and natural cosmogony. The hypothesis put forward by *Kant* and *Laplace. Kant's* work "Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels" (1755) for some time attracted no attention. In 1796 *Laplace,* an astronomer, knowing nothing of *Kant,* wrote his "Exposition du système du monde," and subsequently their theories were combined. Both base their theories on *Buffon. Kant* assumes the existence in space of a glowing, elastic mass, set in motion by the variety of its constituents and by the stronger attraction in the centre of a body in process of formation (interior causes); the planets are formed by an aggregation of atoms. The sun first came into existence, and thus arose our solar system and the universe. *Laplace* imagined a glowing, gaseous sphere, which as it rotated threw off rings that condensed and thus formed the planets; the sun remained after their formation. Both theories are beset with difficulties. They account for the formation of nothing but fixed stars and offer no explanation of the fact that Saturn's inner belt rotates more quickly than the outer one and that his ninth moon, like Neptune's, rotates in an opposite direction; moreover the moons of Uranus do not harmonize with the system. The frequent occurrence of spiral nebulae is left unexplained, and recent accurate observations regarding the time of rotation in the case of planets and satellites do not agree with the theory. *T. C. Chamberlin's* spiral nebulae theory suggests a different explanation for the origin of the planetary system of a sun, but still presupposes the existence of the gaseous sphere. *Karl Braun,* a Jesuit, has retained the fundamental idea, but altered *Laplace's* theory; others abandon it altogether and regard the spiral nebulae as the oldest processes. It is doubtful whether a purely physical explanation of the universe can be given. Nothing can be said for or against these theories from the scriptural point of view.

The biblical account of creation and geology. Geology tries to explain the evolution of the earth by considerations derived from the stratification of rocks and the fossil remains of animals and plants (palaeontology). It distinguishes various ages:

1. *The azoic or archaic,* when the primitive rocks were formed.
2. *The palaeozoic or primary,* when coal was formed. Remains of certain amphibia, reptiles, and fish belong to this era, especially trilobites and brachiopods.
3. *The mesozoic or secondary,* whence date chalk, Jurassic and Triassic rocks.
4. *The caenozoic age, divided into the Tertiary and Quaternary periods.* In the Tertiary period several orders of the higher mammals made their appearance; in the Quaternary, man ap-

peared towards the glacial epoch. He had no predecessors of his own species. We are now living in the epoch called Alluvium.

Geology is a comparatively new science, and only a small part of the earth's surface has been as yet examined. It does not touch the sphere of faith.

"*Werner, Buch, Beaumont, Lyell,* and *Suess* have all put forward theories regarding the origin of the forms now existing on the surface of the earth. These theories are antagonistic to one another, yet all have supporters; in fact each theory has for a time asserted its supremacy. The applause given by his contemporaries to the author of a geological theory must not therefore be regarded as a measure of its accuracy, nor must the rejection of an hypothesis be taken as evidence of its weakness." (*Gäa,* Problems of Geology.)

The biblical account of creation and the theory of descent: the animal world. As early a thinker as *Anaximander* (611–546 B.C.) taught that animate nature had been produced by mechanical means. He believed that the sun's heat had caused bubbles to form in slime and that these had developed into creatures resembling fish. In a similar way *Anaxagoras* (500 B.C.) supposed animals and plants to have been produced by the earth under the influence of heat and moisture. Among the Arabian philosophers *Muhammed ben Edrisi,* a writer on geography, recognized the effect of locality and climate upon breeds of animals. The French scientist *Lamarck* (died 1829) was the founder of the scientific theory of descent. In his "Philosophie zoölogique" (1809) he ascribed the origin of species in the animal kingdom to cross-breeding, to the influence of external circumstances, and especially to the use or neglect of certain organs.

In his "Zoönomia," a book very little known, *Charles Darwin's* grandfather, who was both a zoölogist and a poet, expressed the chief ideas that we now associate with his grandson.

The theory of descent or evolution did not attract much attention, however, until *Charles Darwin* (died 1882) tried to account for all the various forms of animal and plant life by means of two principles, viz., the theory of natural selection and the struggle for existence. He found many followers, won by the simplicity of his explanation of nature and by the novelty of the evidence that he adduced in support of it (rudimentary organs, atavism). *Darwin*[1] had travelled a great deal and was a learned

[1] On the subject of his religious opinions *Darwin* wrote in 1879 to Mr. *Fordyce* as follows: "What my own views may be is a question of no consequence to any one but myself. But, as you ask, I may state that my judgment often fluctuates. . . . In my

zoölogist; he experimented in pigeon-breeding and studied the cumulative effects of slight variations. His theory has no bearing at all upon the mineral kingdom.

Darwinism strictly so called, or the theory of natural selection, was subsequently more or less abandoned, because a purely mechanical explanation, that did not recognize the teleological tendency innate in living creatures, was inadequate to account for the facts of nature. Several new theories, such as vitalism, the theory of mutation, etc., have taken its place. The theory of descent is still accepted at the present day; according to it, a certain evolution has been going on in plants and animals from the earliest times and is still in progress. How far this evolution goes is debatable. In the oldest geological strata there are several kinds of highly developed organisms, and no evidence exists of a monophyletic evolution of living beings. Palaeontology shows that we may probably assume evolution to have taken place only within the limits of certain classes or families.

The extreme theory of descent is antagonistic to Christianity, as it excludes divine intervention and attempts to account for the universe and all animal and human life by the mechanical evolution of matter consequent upon exterior causes. The theory is altogether materialistic.

A modified form of the theory of descent is not incompatible with the Christian theory of the universe. It assumes the Creator to have given certain laws to inorganic nature and to have provided organic nature with certain interior tendencies to develop into the forms that He designed. (On the subject of man and the theory of descent see page 56; also *H. Muckermann,* S.J., The Humanizing of the Brute; Attitude of Catholics towards Darwinism and Evolution; *Zahm,* Bible, Science, and Faith; *Wasmann,* Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution.)

Object of the Creation

God acted with perfect freedom when He created the world. He was subject to no external compulsion

---

most extreme fluctuations I have never been an Atheist in the sense of denying the existence of a God. I think that generally (and more and more as I grow older), but not always, that an Agnostic would be the more correct description of my state of mind." Six years before his death he wrote: "The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an Agnostic."

and to no internal necessity. He is not dependent upon any one and has no need to augment His happiness or to attain perfection. Being absolutely perfect, He is infinitely rich and happy and requires nothing apart from Himself. "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, He hath done, in heaven, in earth, in the sea and in all the deeps." (Ps. cxxxiv, 6.)

Abelard and *Wyclif* assumed that some interior necessity caused God to create the world. "God could create only that which He actually did create." The so-called optimists, *Leibniz, Hermes,* and *Günther,* taught that whatever a most perfect Being creates must be itself most perfect. Hence this world is the best that could possibly exist. *Schopenhauer* and the pessimists, on the other hand, said: "God created a most evil world." Both are wrong, for the world, as it exists, corresponds with God's wisdom and the purpose for which it was created.

God created the universe for a very high purpose, none other than God Himself. He created it for His own glory, as also for the benefit of His creatures, because He is infinitely good, and therefore wished to do good to other beings.

"The Lord hath made all things for Himself." (Prov. xvi, 4.) "Every one that calleth upon my name, I have created him for my glory; I have formed him and made him." (Is. xliii, 7.) God's glory is the primary object of creation, and this must always be attained. It is produced on the one hand by the manifestation of His own infinite perfections (omnipotence, wisdom, goodness), and on the other hand it proceeds from His creatures themselves; those not possessing free will reflect His divine attributes in their order, beauty, etc., whilst angels and men, who have free will, extol His greatness and power and imitate His love and holiness. If the latter do not voluntarily strive to accomplish this end, the secondary object of creation — their happiness in heaven — is not attained, but in that case they are compelled to do honour to God's justice.

Preservation and Government of the World

God in His goodness created the world, and in virtue of the same attribute He preserves and governs it and cares for it.

1. *God preserves the world* not only in a negative way, by averting disasters, but also positively, since His almighty will causes it to continue in existence as long as and in the manner that He chooses.

As surely as a stone, dropped from a man's hand, will fall to the ground, so surely would the world pass away if God withdrew His support. "How could anything endure, if Thou wouldst not?" (Wisd. xi, 26.)

2. *God governs the world* by guiding both rational and irrational creatures to the end for which He created them.

The forces and laws of nature were created by God and reveal His will in preserving the world. The laws governing the preservation, distribution, and development of the human race, which are to be traced in the history of mankind, reveal God's design with reference to man. God's plan for man's salvation is the subject of supernatural revelation. "The history of the world is incomprehensible without a government of the world." (*W. v. Humboldt,* W. W., i, 18.)

God's care in preserving and governing the world is called Divine Providence.

"God made the little and the great, and He hath equally care of all." (Wisd. vi, 8.) "The very hairs of your head are all numbered." (Matth. x, 30.) Instances recorded in Holy Scripture: Joseph in Egypt, the preservation of the Jews by means of Esther, etc.

The existence of evil can be reconciled with God's providence. God does not desire evil, but He permits it, because He has made man free and because He knows how to turn evil into good, i.e., to make it tend to the accomplishment of His designs. Nothing hap-

pens without God. He coöperates in the free actions of man, but He is not on this account the author of evil. God's coöperation extends only to the natural goodness of an action; should the action, in consequence of man's evil intention, become morally bad, that is the work of man.

The deicide of which the Jews were guilty led to the salvation of the world, and their hardness of heart to the conversion of the Gentiles. In the same way persecutions have promoted the glory of the Church. Hence Joseph could say to his brothers: "You thought evil against me, but God turned it into good." (Gen. 1, 20.)

The sin, sorrow, and suffering in the world are not contrary to Divine Providence. Evil does not ultimately proceed from God, but from creatures, and all suffering is a result of original sin. God intends it to convert and teach the sinner and to purify and perfect the just.

The problem of suffering has no adequate solution except in the doctrines of Christianity. Revelation shows us the source, and Christian reason the object of suffering. Bodily pain in the case of animals serves a definite purpose, as without it an injured beast would be unaware of its injury and so would neither protect nor defend itself. With the sensation of pain is given also that of pleasure, which stimulates animals to self-preservation.

Bodily pain and pleasure in the case of man serve primarily the same natural purposes as those of beasts. Man's intellectual powers enable him to discover remedies and means of avoiding and allaying pain as well as of increasing his comforts.

Human beings feel pain more acutely than animals, because they are capable of mental as well as physical suffering and are conscious of the consequences of pain to themselves and those about them. Human pain is, however, far more beneficial, as it is a constant stimulus to mental activity and to the acquisition of knowledge. Progress in science and civilization is generally the outcome of some effort to overcome the difficulties and discomforts of life. The moral incentive supplied by suffering is of a higher order; it leads to the formation of society and to mutual

assistance such as is afforded by the members of a community. Love and esteem are the outgrowth of mutual aid. Pain has a great effect upon man's religious life, for it convinces him of his weakness and dependence upon a higher power. Fervour in prayer, humility, trust in God, active charity, patience, courage, self-knowledge, and penance are all rooted in suffering. "Gold and silver are tried in the fire, but acceptable men in the furnace of humiliation." (Ecclus. ii, 5; cf. Matth. v, 11, 12.)

The disproportion between virtue and its reward, sin and its punishment, which confronts us so often in this world, is not opposed to Divine Providence. God sometimes allows the wicked to prosper and the good to suffer, because we shall receive full retribution only in the world to come. He does not wish merely to deter a sinner from evil, through fear of punishment, but also to draw him to Himself by His favours. Moreover He rewards the few good actions of a sinner in this life, as in the life everlasting He cannot reward one who is not contrite.

"What is there that I ought to do more to my vineyard, that I have not done to it? Was it that I looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it hath brought forth wild grapes?" (Is. v, 4.) "Woe to you that are rich, for you have your consolation," i.e., you have your reward in this life. (Luke vi, 24.)

Faith in Divine Providence is a source of happiness and comfort, for it teaches us to look upon the circumstances of our life as ordered and permitted by God. It promotes peace and order, inspires courage and contentment, and protects us against arrogance and despair.

Divine Providence is denied by

1. *Fatalism,* i.e., belief in fate as a blind, irresistible force, determining the destiny of man.
2. *Casualism,* which sets blind chance in the place of God's providence.

3. *Deism,* which admits that God created the world, but denies that He still preserves and governs it.

II. CREATION, ORIGINAL CONDITION, AND FALL OF MAN

Divine Origin of Man

Man is the masterpiece of creation and lord over all other creatures; this position is assured him by his physical and mental prerogatives.

Man is the connecting link between the spiritual and the physical world. In body he belongs to the world of matter, and yet even there his superiority can be recognized. His beautiful and harmonious structure marks him out as the noblest formation of matter and as the inspiration of art. His erect walk enables him to use to the full all his organs and senses; his face is capable of expressing every emotion; his hand is a most perfect tool at the service of his mind, able to produce the most exquisite drawing or to set in motion the heaviest machinery.

The biblical account of the creation of the first human beings is as follows: "God said: Let us make man to our image and likeness, and let him have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts, and the whole earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth. . . . The Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul. . . . The Lord God said: It is not good for man to be alone; let us make him a help like unto himself. . . . Then the Lord God cast a deep sleep upon Adam, and when he was fast asleep, He took one of his ribs and . . . built the rib . . . into a woman, and brought her to Adam. And Adam said: This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh, she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. . . . And Adam called

the name of his wife Eve, because she was the mother of all the living. . . . And God blessed them saying: Increase and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it, and rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures that move upon the earth." (Gen. i, 26; ii, 7, 18, 21–23; vi, 20; i, 28.)

The foregoing account must be taken as the record of a fact, not as an allegory. God's activity is described in human language and may be understood in various ways. There is a clear distinction between the formation of the body and the creation of the soul. The first man derived his name from the origin of his body, *homo* from *humus* or *φόνος*, the speaker. Adam means earthborn. Woman = wifman, cf. *virago* from *vir*, Eva = life.

The fact that woman was formed from man implies (*a*) that mankind collectively originated in Adam, (*b*) that man and woman are of like nature, (*c*) that in marriage man and wife are united by an indissoluble bond and form a most intimate union.

Man came forth from God by a new creation. The results of scientific research confirm the biblical account, for it cannot be demonstrated that man at any time was produced by evolution from the animal world.

In his body man resembles the vertebrates. His whole skeleton, the arrangement of his limbs, his organs of sense, respiration, and nutrition, his development, his maladies and decay, all are like those of vertebrate animals. As early a writer as *Ennius* says: "How much does the ape, the ugliest of beasts, resemble ourselves!"

Man and the theory of descent. *Charles Darwin* and *E. Haeckel* and their followers believe man to have been evolved from the animal kingdom and to be the descendant of a collateral line of apes. *Mivart* maintained that the human body at least was formed by evolution from animals and that then God made man by breathing a soul into this body. All attempts to prove these theories have hitherto been unsuccessful; they even lack probability.

The difference between man and the anthropoid apes is greater

than it appears at first sight. To man it is natural to walk upright, and in this respect he differs completely from apes. The formation of the knee is quite different, as the sinews of man are tense when he stands upright and those of the ape slack in the same position. No beast has a foot such as man possesses — a flat surface with three points of support and a projecting heel; all beasts walk on their toes, and an ape's foot, being prehensile, displays quite another structure. The relative length of arms and legs is different. Man has a broad back and his spine has an undulatory curve; his legs are round pillars, those of a beast are flattened; and the calf is peculiar to the human leg. In the case of every beast the face is opposite to the point where the head is set on the cervical vertebra; if man were similarly formed, he would look upwards. An ape has neither chin nor forehead, but a parietal ridge. Human teeth are arranged in a close row, whilst in an ape there are spaces in both jaws into which the canine teeth fit. The facial angle of mammals varies from ten to forty-five degrees, but in man it is at least sixty-five degrees. The average weight of an ape's brain is thirteen ounces and of man's thirty-five ounces, the weight of the brain being to that of the body as 1 : 70 in an ape and as 1 : 35 in a man. After birth the human brain grows one thousand and that of a gorilla only six cubic centimetres. "An ape retains the brain of a child throughout its life, although its mouth equals that of an ox in size." (*Platz*, Der Mensch.) *Rütemeyer* remarks: "If we compare a new-born ape with a full-grown orang-utang, we are forced to exclaim: 'Is this what you will become?' The little face, so human in its expression, grows into that of a grinning beast!"

It is impossible to bridge over the chasm caused by man's possession of a soul. Man has understanding and will, whereas a beast has only instinct and impulse; man speaks, whilst a beast growls and roars. "Speech is the Rubicon, and no beast will venture to cross it." (*Max Müller.*) All attempts to discover the "missing link" between man and beast have failed completely. In 1884 a Dutch physician named *Dubois* discovered at Trinil in Java a cranium, one thigh bone, and two teeth which were assumed to belong to some such missing link, that was consequently called the *Pithecanthropus*. The assumption, however, was premature. As the bones were found nearly fifty feet apart, it is doubtful whether they belonged to the same animal. *Virchow, Ranke, Kollmann, v. Zittel, Klaatsch, Bumüller,* and others declared them to be parts of a genuine ape. Quite recently (1908) it has been ascertained that they were found in

diluvial soil, together with many bones of apes, and so belonged to an age in which man already existed; they could not, therefore, have formed part of a "missing link." In the Neandertal near Düsseldorf a cranium discovered in 1856 was pronounced by some of *Darwin's* followers to be that of the long-sought creature, but since then a number of similar remains have come to light, at Sipka in Moravia, at Krapina in Croatia, at Spy and La Naulette in Belgium, at Le Moustier and Cro-Magnon in France, and at Kannstatt and Mauer near Heidelberg. There can be no doubt that they are all human. With the skeleton of a woman, discovered at Moustier de Peyzeck in 1905, vessels were buried belonging to the palaeolithic age, and the bones of a young man, found in 1908 in the same locality, had been carefully laid to rest in a specially prepared grave. In 1908 at Novosiolka in Russia a cranium of the Neandertal type was discovered with things dating from the time of the migration of tribes. A race still existing in Australia exhibits exactly the same cranial formation as the Neandertal man.

"Ten years ago, whenever a cranium was discovered in a bog, or in lake dwellings, or in ancient caves, it was still supposed to show tokens of a savage and undeveloped state; men were on the lookout for apish characteristics. But this attitude of mind has gradually disappeared. The ancient inhabitants of caves, lake dwellings, etc., turn out to have been highly respectable people, with heads of such a size that many of our contemporaries might be glad if they could rival them. . . . We must acknowledge that there is no fossil type belonging to a lower stage of human development. . . . I must say frankly that hitherto no one has discovered any fossil ape's cranium or any pithecanthropus cranium that could really have belonged to a human being." (*Virchow,* Freiheit der Wissenschaft, Berlin, 1877, p. 30.)

"Among men, as known to us, there are no races, nations, tribes, families, or single individuals that can be described zoologically as standing midway between human beings and apes." (*Ranke,* Der Mensch, ii, 392.)

"In history man appears as a genuine *homo novus,* not as the descendant of previous races. It is possible to trace in a long series of fossils the ancestry of most of our present mammals, but man appears suddenly and independently in the diluvial epoch, and we know of no Tertiary ancestors in his case. Man of the diluvial epoch appears at once as a complete *homo sapiens.* Most of these early human beings possessed a cranium that any of us might be proud to have." (Professor *Branko,* director of

the Zoölogical and Palaeontological Institute at the University of Berlin, 1901.)

As long ago as 1889, at the Anthropological Congress in Vienna, *Virchow* said: "The proanthropos — i.e., precursor of man — is no longer a subject for anthropological discussion. Some anthropologist may have beheld it in his dreams, but in his waking hours he has no knowledge of its existence." At Innsbruck in 1894 he said: "The origin of man was sought by way of speculation, not by exact research, and thus men arrived at the ape theory; they might just as well have formed a sheep theory." "*Haeckel* writes (Welträtsel, p. 99): 'In the last twenty years well-preserved fossilized skeletons of apes and prosimiae have been discovered in considerable numbers, and amongst them are all the important links representing a line of ancestry connecting the earliest of the prosimiae with man.' Palaeontologists and anthropologists, however, know nothing of any such 'links.' As to the so-called pedigrees of the ancestors of man, as drawn up by *Haeckel*, it has been rightly remarked that they are just as trustworthy as the pedigrees of Homeric heroes." (Professor *Reinke*, Lectures on Natural Science, 1907, pp. 42, 43.) "Darwinism is a matter of history, like that other curiosity of our century — *Hegel's* philosophy; both are variations of the theme: 'How a generation may be fooled,' and neither is likely to raise our expiring century in the eyes of posterity." (Dr. *H. Driesch*, Biolog. Zentralblatt, 1896, p. 355.)

Windle sums up the results of very painstaking research in these words: "I have carefully limited myself to this single point, and must not be taken as making any statements to the right or to the left of it when I say that, so far as the craniological evidence goes, those who desire to prove the evolution of man's body from that of a lower form have completely failed to make out their case." (The Form of the Human Skull, and Particularly of the Earliest Known Skulls, Dublin Review, 1905. Early Man, *ibid.*, 1913.)

The Nature of the Human Soul

The human soul is an independent, immortal spirit, endowed with reason and free will, and the principle of all vital activity in man.

The human soul is an independent substance, having an existence of its own; it is not a property of the body nor a series of

activities. The soul is the substantial form of the body. Every individual soul is created by God.

The word *soul* is also used in a general way to designate the vital principle of an organism. In this sense we speak of the soul of an animal and even of the vegetable soul; these are both perishable, whereas the human soul is immortal.

The human soul is essentially different from the body; it is a spirit. Such is the teaching of Holy Scripture. After the body was formed the soul was created and breathed into it as the "breath of life." Then and not until then did man become a living being.

Reason also teaches us that the human soul is a spirit and not material. This appears:

1. *From the permanence of man's self-consciousness.* Although the brain, like the rest of the body, is renewed every few years, man from youth to old age is conscious of his personal identity.

2. *From the activity of the mind.* Man is able to grasp material things in an immaterial manner by forming an idea from his perceptions and uniting the ideas so as to deduce from them conclusions and general principles. He has concepts of purely immaterial things which are altogether unconnected with matter, such as purpose, cause, virtue, liberty.

3. *From the activity of the will.* Man is able to strive after immaterial advantages, such as sincerity and loyalty, and to fear and hate immaterial evils, such as censure and cowardice.

By means of reflection man enters into his own being and becomes conscious of his activity and of himself as its cause. A material being, composed of different parts, would be incapable of embracing itself and its activity in one single act. Therefore the soul must be a simple, spiritual substance.

Man has only one soul, which is at once the principle of vegetative, sensitive, and intellectual activity.

Man is aware that in him the same principle is active when he eats, when he perceives the flavour of his food, and when he reflects upon its origin or composition. The conflict between flesh and spirit in man does not proceed from the activity of two principles, but from the fact that the same soul is attracted at the same time by different objects. The human soul in its activity is bound up with the body, because man is not a purely spiritual being. Hence serious disturbances in the body, such as brain disease, may produce disturbances in the spiritual activity, just as an instrument that is out of tune interferes with the musician's activity. The assumption that in man there are many principles of activity mutually independent leads to errors with regard to man's moral responsibility.

Man as a Natural Image of God

God made the first man to His own image and likeness. This likeness is both natural and supernatural, because man was endowed with natural and supernatural gifts that made him like God.

"Let us make man to our image and likeness, and let him have dominion over . . . the whole earth." (Gen. i, 26.)

The natural gifts of the human soul, which make it resemble God, are understanding, free will, and immortality.

We call these gifts natural, because they belong to human nature in such a way that man, if deprived of them, would cease to be man. Therefore they cannot be lost. God's omniscience is reflected in man's understanding, His omnipotence in our free will, and His eternity in our immortality.

The human soul possesses understanding, i.e., it is capable of thought. The objects of thought are man himself, the universe and God, and their mutual relations.

1. Man is self-conscious, i.e., he distinguishes himself as an independent being from all other beings. He knows his own

nature and destiny, his powers, rights, and duties. His self-consciousness testifies to his existence and his activity.

Man surveys the world about him; at first he perceives things separately, then he groups them systematically by means of universal ideas. He can think of purely spiritual things and reflect upon his own thought. He can clothe his ideas in language and apply them to the needs of life. He devises tools and implements, whereby he increases his power and obtains dominion over animate and inanimate nature. He creates crafts, arts, and sciences.

Man recognizes God; he perceives his natural dependence upon God's power and his moral dependence upon God's will, and he distinguishes between good and evil. Thus he arrives at the fear and worship of God. (Religion.)

2. The instinct of animals is limited to what is material and serves only to preserve the individual and the species. When animals learn anything, no intelligence is called into play, but only imitation and a mechanical application of sense experience. An animal possesses imagination and memory, but neither self-consciousness nor power of reasoning; hence it can never advance beyond the limits of instinct.

"I should dismount from my horse if it were able to say 'I am.'" (*Kant.*)

"Of man it is possible to write history, but of beasts only the laws of nature and not history. Since the time of Solomon and Samson the ants and bees have learnt nothing new, and on islands, separated thousands of years ago from the mainland, they live in exactly the same way as with us. In the pyramids spiders spun webs precisely like those that they spin now. . . . Of man we may say: that every head has its own intelligence, but of beasts we can say this only of every species." (*C. Hasert,* Answers of Nature.)

The human soul possesses free will, i.e., the ability to act or not to act and to choose one thing rather than another. Free will is a fact attested by the consciousness of the individual and by the consent of mankind. It is plainly taught by revelation.

1. Just as we are aware of our ability to will, so are we conscious that our will is free. This is obvious from the fact that we reflect on our motives before performing any action, and after its performance we feel satisfaction or regret and make resolutions with regard to future actions. We are able to distinguish

acts of the will that are not free (owing to the influence of sudden fear or something similar) from acts that are free.

2. Mankind is convinced that the will is free, and this conviction is expressed in praise and blame, in rewards and punishments, in laws and regulations.

3. The freedom of the will is clearly stated in Holy Scripture, for all God's admonitions and threats are uttered on the assumption that the will is free.

4. Determinists assert that in all his actions man is irresistibly determined by interior causes or exterior influences (education, environment, etc.) They are right in as far as the will never acts without some motive or reason; but these motives do not compel the will, for in spite of them the will remains free and often decides against good reasons or refuses to listen to any reasons at all. In the same way the will often decides against the strongest influences from without. It is true that the free action of the will may be limited or even totally destroyed by various hindrances, such as hereditary taints, fear, mental disturbances (fixed ideas), pain, passion, or drunkenness. These things affect individuals only.

The human soul possesses immortality and it will survive the dissolution of the body. This is an inevitable consequence of:

1. *Its nature:* the soul is simple and distinct from the body.

Being simple (cf. p. 61) the soul cannot be divided into parts. It has an activity which is independent of the body, and this spiritual activity presupposes a spiritual existence apart from the body, not sharing the destruction of the latter.

2. *Its desire for happiness,* which is inherent in the very nature of the soul.

The wish to be permanently happy is indelibly inscribed on the soul and belongs to its very nature. If the soul is compelled to desire everlasting life, and yet is unable to attain to it, there is a contradiction between its nature and its aim, and this is inconceivable. Therefore the conviction of the immortality of the soul is, like that of God's existence and of our own free will, a general intellectual possession of mankind; it is what *Kant* terms a "postulate of reason."

"A happy life that may be lost is not a happy life at all, for

no man is happy who lives in constant fear of losing his happiness." (*Cicero, de finibus,* i, 26.)

"I do not understand how a soul could die, after being filled by God with the idea of the infinite and with everlasting truths." (*La Bruyère,* Caractères, 26.)

3. *The moral order,* which demands retribution after death.

As in this world virtue does not receive its full reward nor vice its full punishment, just compensation can be made only after this life is over.

"If our souls are mortal, reason is a dream . . . and we have been brought hither like cattle, to seek food and then to die; in a short time it will be a matter of indifference whether I have been an ornament or a disgrace to creation, whether I have striven to increase the number of the happy or that of the miserable. If the soul is mortal, the most abandoned mortal has the power to withdraw himself from God's dominion, and a dagger is enough to sever the bond of union between God and man. If our spirit can perish, the wisest legislators and judges of the human race have deceived themselves and us, and mankind collectively has, as it were, agreed to uphold an untruth, and a state consisting of free, rational beings is nothing more than a herd of irrational cattle, and man — I am loath to contemplate him in such degradation — man, the masterpiece of creation, if robbed of the hope of immortality, becomes the most miserable animal on earth, condemned in his wretchedness to think of his condition, to fear death and to despair." (*Mendelssohn,* Phädon.)

4. The conviction of mankind.

That all nations have believed in life after death is shown by their literature, modes of burial (embalming, pyramids, cities of the dead, etc.), monuments, and inscriptions. Even prehistoric tombs contain objects indicating a belief in another life. Poets, such as *Homer*[1] (Iliad, A, 2–4) and *Ovid*[2] (Metam., xv), and philosophers in every age have proclaimed this faith. It has been examined and discussed most fully by *Plato*[3] (Phaedo, c.

[1] "Many mighty souls of heroes did he [Achilles] speed into Hades."

[2] "Imperishable I shall soar above the stars on high."

[3] "Inasmuch as the soul is manifestly immortal, there is no release or salvation from evil, except the attainment of the highest virtue and wisdom." (Phaedo, 107. *Jowett's* translation.)

79, etc.) and *Cicero*[1] (Tusc. disp., i, 15, 35). *Plato* represents *Socrates* as discoursing on immortality during the night before his death.[2]

God alone would be able to annihiliate the soul, but He never does so, since it would be repugnant to:

1. *His wisdom,* which, having created the soul as an indestructible spirit, is consequently bound to preserve it.

2. *His goodness,* which urges Him to satisfy the craving for unlimited happiness and eternal life that He Himself has implanted in the soul of man.

3. *His justice,* which often allows goodness to go unrewarded and sin unpunished in this world, reserving full retribution for another future life.

There are many passages in the Bible in which the immortality of the soul is clearly stated; e.g., "The dust (shall) return into its earth whence it was, and the spirit return to God, who gave it." (Eccles. xii, 7.) "My brethren, having now undergone a short pain, are under the covenant of eternal life." (2 Mach. vii, 36.) "Fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul." (Matth. x, 28.) In speaking of the last judgment our Lord said: "These shall go into everlasting punishment, but the just into life everlasting." (Matth. xxv, 46.)

The Supernatural Likeness of Man to God

Over and above the natural gifts bestowed by God upon the first man, He conferred upon him other preternatural and supernatural gifts.

---

[1] "If the consent of all is the voice of nature, and all people everywhere agree that there is still something belonging to those who have departed from this life, we also ought to hold the same opinion."

[2] "The soul which is pure at departing . . . departs to the invisible world, to the divine, and immortal, and rational; thither arriving, she is secure of bliss, . . . and for ever dwells in company with the gods." (Phaedo, 80, 81.)

The preternatural gifts were:

1. Full and clear knowledge of created things.
2. Harmony between reason and the lower appetites.
3. Immortality of body and immunity from pain and suffering.

We read in Holy Scripture that God brought all the beasts of the earth and all the fowls of the air to Adam, to see what he would call them, for whatsoever Adam called any living creature, the same is its name. (Gen. ii, 19.) Moreover "God made man right." (Eccles. vii, 30.) "God made not death." (Wisd. i, 13.) "God created man incorruptible . . . but by the envy of the devil death came into the world." (Wisd. ii, 23, 24.) The preternatural gifts were intended to perfect the nature of man, but they were not enough to enable him to attain the final end ordained for him by God, viz., the possession and vision of God in heaven. Hence God bestowed upon him also supernatural gifts.

The supernatural gifts conferred by God upon the first man in order that he might obtain eternal happiness were:

1. Sanctifying grace, which involves
2. Sonship of God, and therefore
3. A right to heaven as his inheritance.

St. Paul bids the Ephesians "be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, who, according to God, is created in justice and holiness of truth." (Eph. iv, 23, 24.) If the Christians were to be renewed in holiness, i.e., if they were to return to the state of original holiness, Adam must have possessed sanctifying grace.

St. Augustine describes the happiness of our first parents in Paradise in the following words: "Man lived in Paradise as he wished, provided that he willed what God commanded. He was good, created by a good God, and he lived, rejoicing in God; he lived, lacking nothing, and he might always have lived thus. There was no corruption in his body, nor did his senses feel any malady; perfect health prevailed in his body, and perfect peace and joy in his soul. There was in him no sorrow and no vain pleasure, his gladness proceeded ever from God, whom he loved fervently with a pure heart and a good conscience. The first

human beings were united by the bond of most virtuous love, inviolable fidelity, and perfect harmony. Moreover there was no antagonism between body and soul, and obedience to one single, simple commandment cost them no effort. Labour was a refreshment, not a weariness, for all was easy. Happiness and delights presented themselves on every side." (de civit. Dei, xiv, 26.)

Unity of the Human Race

Adam and Eve were destined to be the ancestors of the whole human race:

1. *In the natural order;* all human beings were to descend from them, so as to form one family of which Adam is the head.

2. *In the supernatural order;* Adam was to transmit to all his descendants not only his natural, but also his preternatural and supernatural gifts.

That all men are descended from one couple is stated clearly in the Bible (Gen. i, 26–28): "Let us make man . . . and God created man . . . male and female He created them . . . and God blessed them, saying: 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth.'" "God . . . hath made of one, all mankind to dwell upon the whole face of the earth." (Acts xvii, 26.) Genesis x shows how the various nations were descended from Noe's sons. There were neither pre-Adamites nor co-Adamites. The unity of the human race is a necessary hypothesis if the doctrines of original sin and of the redemption are to be universal.

For a time men who denied revelation (such as *Voltaire*) and slave owners refused to believe in the unity of the human race, but it has been firmly established by modern anthropology and ethnography.

It is proved:

1. *By the traditions of various nations,* all of which give an account, similar to that given by the Israelites, of the origin of man. (Folklore.)

Chinese, Arabs, Egyptians, Hellenes (the Prometheus legend),

Germans, as well as African, American, and Ottoman tribes, all preserved a tradition that the first man was formed of clay, was led astray by a woman or by a serpent, thus losing his original happiness, etc. Moreover traditions remained of a great deluge, from which only one couple of human beings escaped, so that all posterity was descended from them.

2. *By philology,* which traces kindred languages back to a common primitive language.

As comparative philology advances, it removes the barriers that seemed to exist between various groups of languages. "It cannot be proved that languages now sharply distinguished may not possibly at one time have been connected. . . . Among the Indo-European languages there are unmistakable traces pointing to the fact that they have passed through a lower stage of development at which they approximated more closely to the structure of the Ural-Altaic language. *F. Hommel* has established the existence of certain points of agreement between the Indo-European and early Semitic languages, especially in the names of mammals, and he regards these words as remnants of some primitive civilization, and as proving that the original homes of both races were in the same region. *Fr. Müller,* who has a profound knowledge of Semitic and Indo-European civilization, ventures to say: 'We have a suspicion that at one period Aryans and Semites lived near one another, and may perhaps have been one people.'" (*Ranke,* Der Mensch, ii, 591.)

3. *By history,* which records that Asia was the cradle of the human race.

That Asia was the cradle is borne out by the grouping of nations. "Nowhere do we find tribes belonging to the three chief branches of the human race in such close juxtaposition as in India." (*Burdach.*) "It seems as if Europe had no aborigines, but derived its population gradually from Asia." (*Grimm.*) The foundations of early civilization were laid in Asia. The zodiac was devised first by the Chaldeans, from whom the Greeks and Hindoos derived their knowledge of it. The weights and measures of the ancients can be traced back to Babylon. The Greeks regarded themselves as autochthonous, but all nations bordering on the Mediterranean owed their religious beliefs to Egypt; and Greek art also, like Etruscan art, was descended from the Egyptian, although it was affected by Assyrian and Persian art. The alphabets used by most civilized

TABLE OF LANGUAGES

Languages, through marked affinities, are grouped together into several great families, which all spring from one parent stock.

1. The Indo-European Languages

INDIAN	IRANIAN	ARMENIAN	GREEK	ILLYRIAN	ITALIAN
Sanskrit Prakrit Pali Hindu Hindustani Sindi, etc.	Zend Old Persian Parsee New Persian Kurdish		Ancient Greek Modern Greek Various dialects	Albanian	Latin Umbrian Oscan Modern Romance languages

KELTIC	SLAVONIC	GERMANIC		
		Eastern	*Northern*	*Western*
Breton Gaelic Erse Manx Welsh	Ancient or Church Slavonic Russian Serbo-Croatian Slavonian Czech Polish	Gothic	Swedish Danish Norse Icelandic	High German Low German Flemish Dutch English

2. The Hamito-Semitic Languages

HAMITIC FAMILY	SEMITIC FAMILY	
	1. Northern Division	*2. Southern Division*
Libyan (Berber), Early Egyptian, Coptic	Assyrian and Babylonian (cuneiform inscriptions) Canaanite languages Hebrew, Samaritan, Phoenician, Carthaginian The Aramaic languages Chaldean and Syriac	Arabic, Ethiopian Tigre, Harari

3. The Scythian or Turanian Languages

Finno-Hungarian Turkish Mongolian Tungusic

nations of Asia, Northern Africa, and Europe, and even the runes of the Germans and Scandinavians, originated in the twenty-two letters of the Phoenician alphabet and point to the existence of an earlier script derived by the Phoenicians from the Egyptians.

4. *By physiology,* which shows all races of men to possess the same bodily formation.

All have the same anatomical structure, the same average duration of life, the same pulse, the same normal temperature, etc. Variations of colour, cranial formation, etc., are unessential and are bridged over by countless intermediate forms; they frequently intersect one another and may be accounted for by heredity and the influence of climate, mode of life, etc. "The differences between negroes, Indians, Caucasians, etc., are not sufficiently great for us to describe each form as a particular species." (*J. Kollmann.*)

5. *By national psychology,* which demonstrates the intellectual unity of the human race, inasmuch as all races possess a natural ability to grasp intellectual and moral truths.

Travellers and missionaries, in early as well as in recent times, tell us that the most savage races are capable of receiving education, of grasping the most exalted truths, and of practising the noblest virtues of a life dedicated to God's service.

Antiquity of the Human Race

There are several reasons why the date of the origin of the human race cannot be determined with precision from Holy Scripture. The genealogies of the Bible are deficient and its chronology vague.

In Hebrew the letters of the alphabet were used as figures, and thus mistakes easily arose. This is the reason why the Septuagint and the Vulgate do not agree as to the age of man; according to the former about six thousand years elapsed between Adam and Christ, but according to the latter only forty-two hundred. "The genealogies of the Bible," observes *M. Wallon,* "having for object to give us the filiation of men and not the succession of time, and being able therefore to suppress intermediaries,

no calculation can, with any degree of certainty, go beyond Abraham." (La S. Bible Résumé.) The genealogies of the Bible are chronological only in as far as this was necessary for the purposes of revelation.

History and anthropology are also incompetent to calculate the age of the human race.

1. The chronological records of the Hindoos, Chinese, and Egyptians ascribe to these nations and their ruling dynasties an existence of many thousand years, but they are plainly untrustworthy. It may, however, be regarded as certain that the civilization, remains of which are found near the Nile, the Tigris, and the Euphrates, belonged to a period earlier than 4000 B.C., and that the civilization of the Sumerians and Accadians was antecedent to that of the Babylonians. It is historically certain also that in this part of the world there was already a strongly differentiated population, comprising various nations and races. There seems good reason for assuming that long periods of time must have been required for the development of these distinct races and the growth of their special forms of civilization, but we have no data enabling us to form a numerical estimate of their duration.

2. The calculations as to the antiquity of man based upon the changes of climate that are supposed to have intervened since his appearance on our planet are equally uncertain. "The whole argument hinges on the celebrated glacial theory, about which so much has been written, but regarding which so little has been definitely ascertained. Men of science are not yet agreed as to the cause of the ice age, still less are they able to tell us how long it prevailed." (*Zahm,* Bible, Science, and Faith.) It is probable that there has been since the appearance of man what has been called a glacial period or an ice age. But the difficulty is to determine when this ice age began and how long it endured. Scientists are greatly at variance in assigning the period at which it occurred and its duration. Hence the figures as to man's antiquity based on these data vary accordingly. *Lyell, Croll,* and *Geike* grant man an antiquity of at least two hundred thousand years. *Prestwich,* however, declares that "the time required for the formation and duration of the great ice sheets of Europe and America need not have extended beyond fifteen to twenty-five thousand years." Geology does not warrant the extravagance of scientists who claim that man's presence on earth dates back several hundred thousand years.

3. The archaeological argument, which is founded on the evolution of the industrial arts, breaks down in the same ignominious fashion. According to this theory, man has passed through three stages, called the stone age, the bronze age, and the iron age, each of very extended duration. "But the fact is, it is utterly impossible to arrive at anything even approximating exact dates for any of the three ages. They are different for different peoples. In some parts of the world we have only one age represented, in others two, in others still all three. Sometimes they occur in succession, more frequently they overlap one another, very often they are synchronous. For this reason, therefore, to construct a system of chronology based on the implements of stone, bronze, and iron that have been used by man in the prehistoric past is at least, in the present state of science, clearly impracticable." (*Zahm,* Bible, Science, and Faith.) The late Abbé Moigno, who made an exhaustive study of all the evidence bearing on the question, gives it as his opinion that "the exact date of the creation of man, of his first appearance on the earth, remains entirely uncertain or unknown, but there would be some rashness in carrying it back beyond eight thousand years." (Splendeurs de la Foi.) "It is possible that the age of the human race is, after all, not much greater than the biblical account states." (*C. E. von Baer,* Natur und Offenbarung, 1877, 482.)

Primitive Condition of Man

The first human beings were created by God in a state of natural perfection, i.e., they possessed both body and mind in a state of full development. This truth is not stated explicitly in the Bible, but it is implied, and may reasonably be inferred.

From the beginning Adam and Eve were full-grown human beings in Paradise. Through their fall into sin they lost their peculiar gift of knowledge. After their expulsion from Paradise they and their children seem to have lived as civilized beings and not in a primitive condition as hunters and fishers. They cultivated the land and kept cattle and were accustomed to use fire. Their clothes consisted of the skins of beasts. The Bible records the progress made in patriarchal times: Cain built permanent dwellings, Jubal invented the lyre and the harp,

Tubal-cain, the smith, made knives of iron and bronze. Lamech was the first to depart from the original custom of monogamy.

The theory that man lived originally in a state of barbarism is altogether without justification.

The prehistoric remains found in tombs reveal an advanced degree of civilization in the bronze and iron ages; even the weapons and implements of the stone age prove primitive man to have been intelligent. Carvings on horn and amber and clay figures are found dating from a very early period. Even diluvial man in Europe produced genuine works of art, which attracted much attention among antiquarians and anthropologists at the time of their discovery, chiefly in caves in Perigord (Southern France) and in the Kessler hole near Lake Constance. On pieces of reindeer horn were scratched very lifelike representations of animals and occasionally of human beings, or the horn was carved into the shape of various creatures. These drawings display a certain development of the artistic sense and a taste for the beautiful.

The Fall of Man

Our first parents were required to merit by the practice of obedience a right to retain and transmit their supernatural gifts. "Of every tree of Paradise thou shalt eat, but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat. For in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death." (Gen. ii, 16, 17.)

The account given in the Bible of the fall of the first human beings into sin (Gen. iii) is not to be regarded as allegorical, but as the report of an actual occurrence. Holy Scripture refers to it as to a fact: "By the envy of the devil death came into the world." (Wisd. ii, 24.) Christ Himself called the devil "a murderer from the beginning." (John viii, 44.) Many legends and traditions speak of it as of an historical happening.

1. The command not to eat of the fruit of the tree was in keeping both with God's wisdom and with man's dignity. It suggested to man that he was free, but at the same time reminded him that it was his duty to make a good use of his liberty.

2. Our first parents committed a very grievous sin in transgressing God's command. They cast aside their belief in His sincerity and their trust in His love, and in their vanity and pride they cherished a desire to become like God and rebelled against His will. Their sin was attended by aggravating circumstances, viz., the slight privation involved in the prohibition in view of the abundance of other gifts; the full measure of grace which they enjoyed; the unimpaired condition of mind and will; and their responsible position as the parents of the entire human race.

Their sin was punished immediately; Adam and Eve were driven out of Paradise, their supernatural likeness to God was destroyed, and their natural resemblance to Him was obscured. Just as Adam's happiness would have been transmitted to all mankind, so did his punishment affect all his posterity. Even the earth and the animals, created for the sake of man, fell under the curse pronounced against Adam.

"Cursed is the earth in thy work; with labour and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." (Gen. iii, 17–19.) "Let the fear and dread of you be upon all the beasts of the earth and upon all the fowls of the air and all that move upon the earth." (Gen. ix, 2.)

Original Sin

Adam's fall involved the whole human race in ruin; for his sin and its consequences were transmitted to all mankind, so that now we all come into the world infected with sin. This is called original or hereditary sin, because we have not personally committed it, but

have inherited it from the founders of our race. In speaking of sin we must distinguish the sinful act from the sinful state resulting from it. Adam was guilty of the sinful act, but his descendants are affected by the state, viz., the loss of original sanctity and justice. Adam, the founder of the race, sinned, and so the family inheritance of innocence and grace was lost.

Inasmuch as the absence of sanctifying grace constitutes original sin, it must be described as real sin, for it separates man from God, his supernatural end. The doctrine of original sin was denied by the Pelagians, the Semi-Pelagians, and the naturalists of the eighteenth century (*Rousseau's* Emile), and at the present day it is rejected by the rationalists and socialists. Some of the heretics in the sixteenth century exaggerated the doctrine and maintained that, in consequence of original sin, the whole nature of man was utterly corrupt and his will completely perverted.

The doctrine of original sin is one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. It accounts for the existence of evil in the world and for the temptations to which every human being is exposed. It influences political and social science and assigns its aim to Christian pedagogics.

1. Evil in human society is not exclusively the result of imperfect legislation and bad institutions. Poverty and disease, injustice and crime, arrogance and insubordination cannot be extirpated by raising the standard of education and of comfort or, in other words, by external advance in civilization. When suitable measures are adopted for dealing with the intellectual, moral, and economic needs of a nation, many reasons for discontent and disorder are removed, but all evils cannot be completely abolished, nor is it possible for a state of universal contentment to prevail. Among sinful men education and comfort often give rise to new evils. Prisons, hospitals, and asylums are indispensable in a world spoilt by original sin. The political theories put forward by communists, socialists, and evolutionists are unattainable ideals, as incapable of realization as those propounded by Sir *Thomas More* in his "Utopia" (1535). "The

poor you have always with you." (John xii, 8.) These words will never prove false.

2. The temptation to sin and to violate the recognized moral order proceeds from the corruption of our nature by original sin. Our obscured intellect and our weakened will power are not in themselves enough to check the excesses of our passions. No individual, relying solely upon his natural strength, can observe the moral law. His natural strength may indeed be increased by education (ethical training, undenominational morality), by example and precept, by admonitions and warnings, and by asceticism, but these things cannot enable it permanently to withstand temptation. To do this it requires the help of supernatural grace, acquired by prayer and by means of the sacraments. Hence the internal civilization of the individual, upon which the real civilization of society depends, can be the result only of a Christian education.

The existence of original sin is mentioned plainly in both the Old and the New Testament. "Behold," exclaims the psalmist, "I was conceived in iniquities, and in sins did my mother conceive me." (Ps. l, 7.) *John the Baptist* received our Saviour by the Jordan with the words: "Behold the Lamb of God; behold Him who taketh away the sin of the world." (John i, 29.) *St. Paul* writes: "By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death, and so death passed upon all men in whom all have sinned." (Rom. v, 12.)

The doctrines and practices of the Church from the very beginning were in harmony with this belief. *St. Augustine* appealed to tradition against the Pelagians and wrote: "On account of this Catholic truth judgment is given against you by the holy and . . . famous priests *Irenaeus, Cyprian . . . Ambrose, Gregory . . .* and *Basil,* to whom I may add *Jerome* the priest, not to mention those who are not yet fallen asleep." (Contra Julianum, l. 1 and 2.) Ever since the time of the apostles the Church has practised infant baptism, which presupposes a belief in the universality of original sin.

The consequences of original sin are:

1. God's displeasure and the loss of all right to look

upon Him as our Father or to inherit the kingdom of heaven.

2. Ignorance, lust, and tendency to evil.

3. Pain and sorrow of every kind, and finally death.

These consequences are all mentioned in Holy Scripture. "We were by nature children of wrath." (Eph. ii, 3.) "The imagination and thought of man's heart are prone to evil from his youth." (Gen. viii, 21.) "I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind." (Rom. vii, 23.) "Great labour is created for all men, and a heavy yoke is upon the children of Adam, from the day of their coming out of their mother's womb, until the day of their burial." (Eccles. xl, 1.)

"Man has become an enigma. If he has reached the highest pitch of education, he is at the lowest stage of morality; if he is free, he is brutal; if he refines his habits, he forges fetters for himself; if he becomes illustrious for his knowledge, he loses his power of imagination; if he is a poet, he ceases to be practical; his heart is enriched at the cost of his intellect, and his intellect at the cost of his heart; the more he feels, the poorer he is in ideas; and when he expands his ideas, he diminishes his capacity for feeling. Power makes him harsh and rough; weakness imparts a charm." (*Chateaubriand,* Génie du christ., l. 3, ch. 3.)

The literature of the civilized nations of antiquity clearly reflects the consciousness of an original guilt.

Even pagan nations have retained:

1. *A remembrance of Paradise.* To this class belong all the traditions of Elysium, the islands of the Blessed, the Gardens of the Hesperides, the Hyperboreans and Atlantis among the Greeks, the belief entertained by the Germans that fertile country was changed into glaciers on account of the wickedness of man, and the legend of the golden age current among the Hindoos, Persians, and Romans. Norse mythology has a tradition of the great tree Igdrasil, upon which the universe rests, so

that with it the earth stands or falls; this is probably a reminiscence of the tree of life in Paradise.

2. *The consciousness of some ancient offence.* The idea of rebellion against God underlies the story of Prometheus and the Titans. It is suggested also by the rites of purification performed at the birth of children. The thought of some ancestral guilt runs through all ancient tragedy, and it is indicated also by the doctrine, common to Egyptians, Greeks, and Celts, of the transmigration of souls and of their previous sinful existence. (Pythagoreans.) *Empedocles* spoke of the soul as banished from the joyous land of life and sent hither to die.

3. *The consciousness of human misery. Hesiod* and *Ovid* both speak of life as a punishment. *Homer* says that of all creatures creeping and breathing on earth, none is so unhappy as man. (Il., XVII, 446.) *Sophocles* writes: "Never to be born at all is the best, but if one exists, then the second best is to depart as quickly as may be to the place whence he came." (Oed. Co., 1225.) *Plautus* declares that the gods treat men as their playthings. (Captivi, prol. 22.)

4. *The consciousness of a tendency to evil. Ovid* says that we are prone to evil and desire always to have what is forbidden. (Amor., III, 4, 17.) He represents Medea as saying: "I see and approve what is better, but I follow what is worse." (Metam., VII, 20.) *Euripides* also remarks that we know and recognize what is best, but we do not act accordingly.

The Church teaches that the Blessed Virgin Mary alone was without stain of original sin. She was "at the first moment of her existence by a special privilege of God, bestowed in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, preserved from all stain of original sin." (Bull of *Pius IX,* Dec. 8, 1854.)

We believe this special favour to have been granted her for the following reasons:

1. In the Old Testament we read that God, speaking to the serpent, said: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel." (Gen. iii, 15.)

2. In the New Testament we are told that the Archangel Gabriel greeted our Lady as "full of grace."

3. Reason shows us that it would not have been seemly for

God to allow the mother of His only-begotten Son to be even for a moment under the power of the devil.

4. Tradition bears witness to our Lady's freedom from sin. The fathers of the Church speak of her as the pure Virgin, immaculate, untouched by the poisonous breath of the serpent. The feast of her Conception has been celebrated in the West ever since the sixth century, and in the East from a still earlier date.

In 1854 the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, clearly contained in the teaching of the Church, was solemnly defined as an article of faith by *Pius IX.*

The Promise of a Future Redemption

As a result of man's separation from God, it would have been impossible for any human being to obtain grace and to be saved, since divine justice demanded in expiation of the insult offered to God a punishment proportionate to the offence. As the insult offered to God's infinite majesty was itself infinite, the satisfaction required also had to be of infinite value, and to make such atonement was beyond the power of any human being and of mankind collectively.

But God had mercy upon our fallen race and promised, even in Paradise, that there should come a Redeemer, who, by making full satisfaction for sin, should release men from it, restore them to grace, and make them once more heirs of the kingdom of heaven. This promise is the Protoevangelium, the first announcement of good tidings. God said to the serpent: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel." (Gen. iii, 15.)

CHAPTER V

THE WORD OF GOD

I. DIVINE REVELATION IN GENERAL

Meaning of the Word "Revelation"

WHEN we speak of divine revelation, we mean the communication of important truths necessary to salvation, made by God to man. We distinguish:

1. A *natural* revelation through God's works, which reflect His attributes. This revelation is accepted by the natural light of reason.

2. A *supernatural* revelation through God's word; this revelation is accepted by the supernatural light of faith.

3. A *heavenly* revelation of God through His essence; this revelation is accepted by the light of glory.

1. A divine communication may be made through an interior or exterior vision, a spoken word or a direct inspiration.

2. Revelation is called *natural* when the natural faculties of our reason suffice for its recognition; but where they are insufficient, the revelation is called *supernatural.*

Supernatural is superior to natural revelation (*a*) in the greater certainty that it affords, (*b*) in the more direct mode of the communication, and (*c*) in the greater amount of truth that it contains.

3. Supernatural revelation is divided into that of the Old Testament, or pre-Christian, and that of the New Testament, or Christian revelation. (cf. p. 89.)

Possibility of Revelation

A revelation on the part of God to man would be impossible if it were contrary either to the essence of God or to the nature of man.

For God to reveal Himself is in harmony with:

1. His whole Being, and especially His power and wisdom.

2. Man's nature, which needs, and is capable of, instruction by the supreme Intelligence.

1. An argument in favour of the possibility of revelation is supplied by the religious belief of most nations, who either base their religion upon some revelation already given or hope for divine communications in the future. *Plato* says: "The ancients, as they stood nearer to the gods, preserved this tradition better than we do. Hence we must accept what the ancients handed down to us regarding religion, although we cannot always prove its truth." (Phileb., 16.)

2. The possibility of a supernatural revelation is denied by the rationalists, who argue that, if God makes a revelation, His work of creation must have been incomplete. God, however, did not exhaust His powers at the creation, but can at any time effect something new for His own ends.

Necessity of Revelation

Revelation is indispensable to men if they are:

1. To know supernatural truths. Left to his own resources, man could never know his supernatural end, the beatific vision, nor the means leading to this end, such as grace and the means of grace.

2. To know mysteries or truths beyond the reach of reason. Without revelation man could have had no perception of such mysteries as the Trinity, the Incarnation, etc., for they are beyond human reason, and even after they have been revealed, man cannot fully comprehend them.

1. In the Book of Wisdom we read (ix, 16, 17): "Hardly do we guess aright at things that are upon earth, and with labour do we find the things that are before us. But the things that are in heaven, who shall search out? And who shall know Thy thought, except Thou give wisdom, and send Thy holy Spirit from above?"

2. It is not derogatory to man to accept these mysteries, for they are propounded to him by supreme Wisdom and Truth. The subordination of a higher to a lower intellect is a degradation, but not the subordination of a lower to a higher, since thus the lower is raised, ennobled, and illumined. In every day life the great majority of both educated and uneducated people depend upon the knowledge and skill of others (e.g., of physicians). We do not hesitate to avail ourselves of their help, though we do not understand their actions. In the same way we are obliged to acknowledge in nature the existence of many mysteries that we cannot explain. "The most exact research even in material things has shown that there are certain barriers which we cannot pass, and the old enigma of the universe and of all existence remains unsolved, in spite of all our progress; and we recognize more clearly perhaps than the philosophers of previous scientific epochs, that its solution is beyond the power of man." (Prof. *Julius Wiesner,* rectorial address given at Vienna, Oct. 24, 1898.)

Revelation is morally necessary if man is to have a full and certain knowledge of natural religious truths. By the aid of reason he may indeed arrive at a knowledge of the existence and essence of God, the origin of the world, the duty of worshipping God, and the natural moral law, but he can acquire this knowledge only with difficulty and imperfectly.

1. *With difficulty.* for most men do not possess sufficient ability and education to apply themselves to serious mental work, nor are they inclined to sacrifice the pleasures of life to their quest of truth. "Must not even the best and most profound philosophers acknowledge that there are many things which they do not know, and many other things that they have to learn over and over again?" (*Cicero,* Tusc. disp., I, 5.)

2. *Imperfectly.* Human life is too short for a thorough examination of even the most important questions, and a vast fortune would not suffice to procure all the aids required for

such an inquiry. After *Cicero* has mentioned and criticized the various theories regarding the human soul, he adds in despair: "Which of these views is correct, some god may decide, but even the most probable opinion remains very doubtful." (Tusc. disp., I, 11.) *Plato* sanctioned slavery and the contempt of all who were not Greeks; he ordered sickly children to be abandoned, and justified unnatural vice. *Cicero,* like the Stoics, approved of suicide.

3. The revelation of natural religious and moral truths is adapted to human nature and most beneficial. Even in our natural life we acquire most of our knowledge from information given us by others who are experts in their particular departments, and in matters of religion and morals this method is shorter, easier, and more efficacious than any other. The last consideration is particularly important in temptation, for then God's word has infinitely greater weight than all motives suggested by reason and all the eloquence of philosophers.

According to the testimony of history, nations, when left to themselves without revelation, fell into very grave errors regarding religion and morals.

This is proved by pagan religions in every age and by the teaching of philosophers who either knew nothing of revelation or refused to accept it. Greek philosophers and modern monists alike confuse spirit and matter, the finite and the infinite, and seek the cause of the world's existence in the world itself, instead of beyond it. According to their dispositions, some took an optimistic, others a pessimistic view of the aim of life; some taught that the good things of this world ought to be despised, others that they should be enjoyed to the full. The purer doctrines set forth by *Plato* and *Aristotle* were not generally accepted, and ancient philosophy ended in universal doubt (*Pyrrho*) and despairing pessimism. The history of philosophy shows most plainly the necessity of revelation and confirms *Hegel's* sarcastic saying, which strikes at his own philosophy: "To every new system, as it is devised, may be applied the words addressed by Peter to Saphira: 'The feet of them, who have buried thy husband, are at the door, and they shall carry thee out.'" (Hist. of Phil.)

How Revelation may be Known

Revelation is made by God to man for his salvation. If man is bound to accept God's revelation, it must be possible for him to recognize it, and there must be certain marks by means of which revelation can be discerned as a divine communication. These marks are called *criteria.*

We distinguish (1) internal criteria, drawn from the contents of revelation, and (2) external criteria, connected with the person through which the revelation is made or the circumstances attending it.

Internal criteria are the majesty and purity of a doctrine and its beneficial influence upon the spiritual and moral being of man.

External criteria are the spiritual and moral integrity of the person making the communication, and especially the miracles and prophecies that accompany it.

Miracles and Prophecies

Miracles are extraordinary, sensible occurrences which cannot be accomplished by natural forces, but must be attributed to God's omnipotence.

1. We may distinguish miracles which in themselves transcend the forces of nature, such as the raising of the dead and the transfiguration of Christ, from those which transcend the forces of nature only in the manner of their occurrence, such as the sudden cure of a sick person.

2. God alone can work miracles or cause them to be wrought by the agency of angels and saints, because He alone is not subject to the forces and laws of nature. Men, angels, and evil spirits can perform wonders, or work apparent miracles, by making a skilful use of the forces of nature.

Miracles are possible; they are in keeping with:

1. *The order of the universe,* in which the weaker

are subordinate to the stronger forces, and the lower to the higher aims.

1. The forces of nature are constant; yet in isolated instances, even in the natural order, the action of the weaker forces is neutralized by that of the stronger. Thus the organic force of a blade of grass overcomes gravitation and raises aloft the matter that it has assimilated. Moreover the substances assimilated by a plant receive chemical properties other than those originally possessed, because they now have to serve higher ends. If the blade of grass dies, the previous forces reassert themselves. Such suspension of the lower for the benefit of the higher order belongs to the very essence of the order of the universe.

2. The forces of nature are constant, even when miracles take place. In this case, too, their action is interrupted or hindered by God's supreme power for some higher and supernatural aim in an isolated instance. Water was once changed into wine, but all other water remains water and all other wine is the product of the grapevine. Since the whole world in its origin and preservation is dependent upon God's power, even these interventions in the natural for the sake of the supernatural order are in harmony with God's original design. From this point of view a miracle is a homogeneous completion, an exaltation and perfecting of the order of the universe, which is thus made in a particular way capable of serving the highest order.

2. *The nature of God,* whose omnipotence works the miracles and whose wisdom assigns them a place in His design of the universe.

1. God, being omnipotent, *can* at any moment interfere with the order of the universe. Were He unable to do this, the world would be independent of Him and He would not be absolute.

2. God *may* at any moment interfere with the order of the universe, provided that He in His wisdom sees the reason for so doing to be adequate. The ratification of a divine revelation is an adequate reason. When God wishes to reveal Himself to man, He must attract man's attention and enable him to recognize with certainty the divine character of the revelation. Miracles are admirably suited to accomplish this end. They are not therefore mere disturbances in the order of the universe, but they form part of God's design and are ordinary means devised

by His wisdom for the attainment of definite aims, and as such they have been preordained by Him from all eternity.

3. Arguments against the possibility of miracles are based upon a mistaken idea either of God or of the universe. *David Strauss* fancied that God could not be unchanging if He ever permitted miracles to interrupt the usual order. This argument is invalid, because God is not changed by His external action. He is the author of all change, whilst remaining Himself unchangeable. *Wolf* thought that miracles were contrary to God's wisdom, being a "correction" made in creation. *Büchner* considers it derogatory to God to imagine Him as acting like a watchmaker, "giving the universe a push or tightening a screw." Both arguments are superficial. Miracles do not effect an improvement in the order of the universe, but serve a higher purpose, altogether superior to it. *Feuerbach* believed that the occurrence of miracles would make it impossible to know anything with certainty about nature. This fear is groundless; the occasional disturbance of health by disease does not prevent our knowing what health is, and, in the same way, the exceptional occurrence of a miracle does not leave us in any doubt as to the regular order of nature.

Miracles can be verified:

1. As *facts,* since they fall under the senses or may be accepted on human testimony.

2. As *marvellous or miraculous phenomena,* because it can be ascertained when a particular effect surpasses the powers of nature.

1. The occurrence of a miracle is established by the same organs and with the same certainty as other facts perceptible through the senses. The miraculous passage of the Red Sea and the revelation made by God on Mount Sinai are historical facts as much as the wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness; the same witnesses bear testimony to them and do so with equal assurance. In the same way the raising of Lazarus is a fact recorded by the same eyewitnesses as our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem.

2. The miraculous character of these occurrences cannot be questioned. We do not indeed know all the forces of nature, nor all that they can effect, but we know their limits. At the mouth of a river we may not be able to point out precisely where the river ends and the sea begins, but we know that what is

above is river and what is below is sea. We may not be able to determine precisely how long it takes for a broken bone to unite, but we know that the necessary process of cell formation and hardening requires some time, that blindness is not cured with spittle, nor leprosy by the touch of a hand, and that the dead do not come to life again at the sound of a voice.

Prophecy consists in disclosing or predicting, accurately and positively, hidden or future events which cannot be conjectured or foreseen from natural causes.

1. Prophecies relate to the free actions of God, such as the deluge, brought about in punishment for sin, or to the free actions of man, such as *St. Peter's* denial of our Lord.

2. In a prophecy the knowledge and communication must be clear and certain, not ambiguous or conjectural. The utterances of the ancient oracles and sibylline books were all ambiguous.

It is reasonable to accept miracles and prophecies for which there is good evidence. Miracles are the work of God's omnipotence, prophecies of His omniscience. They are irrefragable evidences of those truths in confirmation of which they have been wrought, because God, being all truth and holiness, can never confirm what is false or erroneous. They are, as it were, seals given by God to accredit the divine mission of those He sends forth.

"No one who believes in a personal God, ruling the universe, finds any difficulty in believing in miracles and prophecies. There is nothing repugnant about them. Those who deny their possibility are as a rule influenced by atheists or rationalistic doctrines. A Christian neither desires nor dreads miracles. When they occur, a careful investigation of their genuineness is legitimate and necessary. The false miracles of paganism can be readily detected, as they differ in nature, circumstance, and object from those wrought in favour of Christianity. Instead of assuming that there can be no real miracles because false ones occur, we ought rather to say that, because there are false miracles, there must be true ones." (*Pascal*, Pens., II, a. 16.)

The Fact of Revelation

There exists a revelation, shown by its credentials to be divine. God revealed Himself:

1. To the ancestors of the human race. (Paradisiacal revelation.)
2. To the patriarchs. (Patriarchal revelation.)
3. To the people of Israel through Moses and the prophets. (Mosaic revelation.)
4. Finally and most perfectly to the whole human race through Jesus Christ and His apostles. (Christian revelation.)

This divine revelation forms one consistent whole, in which the later presupposes the earlier; and the earlier is amplified in the later. Therefore *St. Paul* says: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by His Son." (Hebr. i, 1, 2.)

In confirmation of their divine mission the patriarchs and prophets, Christ and the apostles, worked undeniable miracles and uttered prophecies proved by their subsequent fulfilment to have been true. (Exterior criteria.) Moreover they inculcated doctrines which are in perfect harmony with reason and with the noblest aspirations of man. (Interior criteria.)

The most important miracles and prophecies are recorded in the Old and the New Testament.

We may conclude from the existence of a revelation that the religion based upon it is the only true religion. It is true because it is revealed by God, and it is the only true religion because God, having clearly defined

the service which pleases Him, thereby rejects all other forms of worship.

Sources of Revelation

Divine revelation comes to us through two channels, Scripture and tradition.

The Bible is a collection of books written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and recognized by the Church as the word of God.

The expression "Holy Scripture" occurs in the epistles of *St. Paul* (Rom. i, 2; 2 Tim. iii, 15) and denotes the respect paid by the faithful to the books containing the truths of revelation and to the Holy Ghost who inspired the writers. The word "Bible" was used first by Greek authors, who spoke of the sacred books simply as *βιβλία*, the books. It was not until the Middle Ages that the word "Biblia" became a noun used in the singular.

Holy Scripture is divided into the books of the Old and the New Testament, or, of the Old and the New Covenant.

"Testament" is used chiefly in the sense of bond or covenant, but that of bequest or legacy on the part of God to man is not excluded.

II. THE PRE-CHRISTIAN REVELATION

The Books of the Old Testament

The Old Testament contains the pre-Christian revelation, i.e., the truth revealed to mankind before the coming of Christ.

The Old Testament consists of:

1. Twenty-one historical books, containing the account of the creation of the universe and the history of the patriarchs and Jewish nation.

2. Seven didactic books, containing collections of psalms, wise sayings, and rules of life.

3. Seventeen prophetical books, containing prophecies as well as instructions and admonitions.

The twenty-one historical books are: the five books of Moses, the book of Josue, Judges, Ruth, the four books of the Kings, the two Chronicles (or Paralipomena), Esdras, Nehemias, Tobias, Judith, Esther, and the two books of the Machabees.

The seven didactic books are: Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes or the Preacher, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus or Sirach.

The seventeen prophetical books are: Isaias, Jeremias and Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, and Malachias.

1. *The Pentateuch,* also called the Thora, or law, consists of the five books known as Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. They form a consecutive whole and contain the history of revelation from Adam to Moses, the laws of the Old Covenant, and the earliest history of the people of Israel and of the human race in general. All the subsequent books of the Old Testament are based upon the Pentateuch, which was compiled by Moses about 1500 B.C., although a few portions are later additions.

The other historical books of the Old Testament carry on the history of revelation and of the chosen people from the time when the Jews took possession of Canaan under Josue, through the periods when they were governed by judges and kings respectively, and through the time of their captivity in Assyria and Babylon, down to their political and religious struggle against foreign supremacy under the leadership of the famous Machabees.

2. Of *the didactic books* the most important are the Psalms and the Canticle of Canticles. The book of psalms is a collection of one hundred and fifty religious songs, composed by David, Solomon, Asaph, and others and used in the offices of the Catholic Church. There are psalms of praise, of thanksgiving,

and of supplication, as well as the penitential and prophetical psalms. The Canticle of Canticles, composed by Solomon, depicts under the form of earthly love the union between God and Israel, and figuratively the bond between Christ and the Church and between God and pure souls dedicated to His service.

3. *The prophetical books* are the works of the prophets, who were holy men, chosen by God, and commissioned to make known His revelation to the Israelites and to proclaim His will and His decrees, so as to preserve their faith in the one true God and their anticipation of a Redeemer. As a guarantee of their divine mission the prophets possessed the power to work miracles and to foretell future events. We distinguish the prophets who wrote from those who only spoke, and the former, according to the length of their works, are divided into major and minor prophets.

The major prophets are Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and Daniel. *Isaias* lived in the eighth century B.C., when the Assyrian empire was coming into power. He announced to the Israelites the coming of a Redeemer and the permanence of God's kingdom, in spite of the attacks of pagan nations. The Redeemer was to belong to the family of David and to be born miraculously of a virgin. *Jeremias* foretold the Babylonian captivity, the destruction of the Temple (his Lamentations were written after this took place), and he insisted upon the need of repentance. *Ezechiel* lived in captivity in Babylon; it was his task to revive the courage of the Jews, then at a low ebb on account of the destruction of Jerusalem, and to proclaim their restoration to God's favour if they amended their ways. *Daniel* was active during the whole time of the captivity (606–534); he was a statesman at the Babylonian court and occupied honourable positions. He devoted himself less to the Jews than to the Gentiles, for it was his duty to convince the latter of the power, wisdom, and justice of the true God and to announce to them the rise of a great kingdom, governed by God, which should outlast the mightiest empires of the world. The last of the prophets before John, our Lord's immediate predecessor, was *Malachias,* who lived about 450 B.C. and foretold the abolition of Jewish sacrifices and their replacement by a new and more perfect offering.

The languages used in the Old Testament are Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. By far the larger part is in Hebrew; only a few chapters of the books of

Esdras and Daniel are in Aramaic, and the book of Wisdom and the second book of the Machabees are in Greek. The books of Baruch, Tobias, Judith, the first book of the Machabees, Ecclesiasticus, and parts of Esther and Daniel have been preserved only in the Greek version, but they were written originally either in Hebrew or in Aramaic.

1. *Hebrew,* with the Phoenician and Carthaginian languages, forms a branch of the Semitic family, to which the Arabic, Assyrian, and Aramaic languages also belong. It was the language of the tribes that settled in Palestine after the dispersion of the nations. The Canaanites (Phoenicians) adopted this language, as Abraham subsequently did; he had originally spoken Aramaic (Babylonian). In the last few centuries before the birth of Christ, Hebrew gave place to Aramaic and was retained only as the language used in religious worship. Except in the books of Holy Scripture it survives only in inscriptions and on coins.

2. The *Greek* of the Bible is the idiom that was universally spoken after the time of Alexander the Great. It contains many Hebraisms and is called Hellenistic, because the Jews who spoke Greek were termed Ἑλληνισταί. Not only are many Hebrew words incorporated in this language, but in many cases Greek words are used in a Hebraic signification and Hebrew constructions occur. The earliest texts of Holy Scripture exhibit, with regard to their language, the characteristics of the time and place of their compilation.

The Authenticity of the Old Testament

If an historical document is to be regarded as an unimpeachable authority, it must be authentic, intact, and veracious. It is authentic or genuine if it belongs to the time and the author to which it is assigned; it is intact if its contents have come down to us without any essential alterations; it is veracious if the author was well informed and sincere.

The books of the Old Testament are genuine, i.e.,

the oldest ones originated soon after the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, and the others were written by divinely enlightened men in the course of the succeeding century. This is proved by:

1. The traditional testimony, as unanimous as constant, of both Jews and Samaritans.

2. *Their contents;* they record God's goodness and faithfulness and the disloyalty of His chosen people. Had they been forged by Jews, they would certainly have been filled with statements favourable to their nation, rather than condemnatory of their doings.

3. *Their character;* they contain very austere demands upon the Israelites and threats of severe penalties, as well as the announcement of the final rejection of the Jews. No nation would have allowed such books to be foisted upon itself, but would have refused to accept them, had it not been certain that they were the work of the divinely commissioned authors whose names they bear.

4. *Their structure;* even the earliest prophetical books contain allusions to still older writings, especially to the Pentateuch. Isaias speaks of sacrifices, Sabbaths, new moons, etc., exactly as they are mentioned in Exodus and Leviticus. Osee, Amos, and Micheas upbraid the Jews for their disloyalty to God, and this would have no meaning unless a covenant with God and a divinely given code of laws had existed.

5. *The testimony of Christ and the apostles,* who knew that the Jews believed their sacred books to be genuine, and confirmed this belief.

From a very remote time care was taken to distinguish the authentic from the unauthentic books of the Old Testament. In the age of the Machabees, as well as later, books of legendary

character were composed and ascribed to biblical personages. This was done both by Jews and Christians, and books of this sort, called apocrypha, were put in a category of their own. To this class belong several works ascribed to Henoch, the psalms of Solomon, the Assumption of Moses, the book of Jubilees or Little Genesis, the Martyrdom of Isaias, and various works on the subject of Adam and Eve and of Abraham.

Integrity of the Old Testament Texts

The books of the Old Testament have come down to us free from corruption. This is guaranteed by:

1. The high esteem in which the Jews held their sacred books and the care with which they preserved them. The contents of the Pentateuch were known to every Jew, since these books were the foundation of all civil and religious life. The priests were bound to read the Thora aloud and expound it to the people, and Moses ordered that a copy of the original should be kept with the Ark of the Covenant, in order that subsequent copies might be revised in accordance with it.

2. The testimony of Christ and the apostles, who frequently quoted the Old Testament.

"Search the scriptures," said our Lord (John v, 39), "... the same are they that give testimony of me." And again: "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. ... If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if one rise again from the dead." (Luke xvi, 29, 31.)

The character of the Hebrew used in the Bible shows that great care has been taken to preserve the text. In a long stone inscription regarding Mesa, king of Moab (cf. 4 Kings iii, 4), who lived in the ninth century B.C., we have a record in non-biblical Hebrew. "If this text is compared philologically with the books of the Judges and of the Kings or with the earlier prophetical books, it seems to be of later rather than of earlier date. We are justified, therefore, in assuming that the text of the books just mentioned has remained unaltered since the time of the first kings of Israel. It must be admitted that the books of Moses and Josue exhibit, with regard to certain

archaic peculiarities, marks of a still earlier stage of linguistic development." (*F. Kaulen,* Introduction to S. S., 55.)

Trustworthiness of the Old Testament

The books of the Old Testament are trustworthy.

1. This is true of the historical books, whose authors (*a*) were in a position to tell the truth, since for the most part they actually witnessed the events they recorded. It was only in writing the book of Genesis that Moses had to rely upon tradition, the purity of which was guaranteed by the longevity of the men of that period and the seclusion in which the Israelites lived.

(*b*) The writers of the historical books had every intention of telling the truth, as is plain from their character and from their objective and impartial manner of writing.

(*c*) They could not deceive, since they wrote for contemporaries, who were familiar with both the circumstances of the time and the existing accounts of former events.

2. The didactic and prophetical books are trustworthy, for the dignity and purity of their teaching are sufficient evidence of their truth.

It has been said that the ethics of the Old Testament are not always above criticism. For instance, Abraham acted deceitfully in Egypt, and Jacob deceived his father without incurring any blame. The Israelites treated the Canaanites with cruelty, and the punishments inflicted upon Core's followers, upon the priests of Baal, and upon the children who derided Eliseus are considered to have been excessive. These objections are not justifiable. It is true that in the Old Testament many sinful and criminal actions are recorded without any adverse criticism, but it does not follow that they are thereby sanctioned or approved. The moral principles by which such actions ought to be judged are stated plainly enough in other places. The severe penalties,

inflicted especially upon idolators, were necessary in order to make the chosen people adhere to the true faith. This remark applies also to the children at Bethel, as that town was notorious for calf worship.

The Old Testament and infidel critics. About the middle of the nineteenth century certain Protestant theologians, belonging to the so-called historical and critical school, began to question the historical value of the Old Testament and constructed a new history of Israel, not at all in harmony with Holy Scripture. According to them, Israel was in no sense a chosen people, but a Semitic tribe like any other. All that is recorded in the Old Testament with regard to God's guidance and revelation is a "pious deception" and originated only after the Captivity, having been partly invented, partly interpolated into older documents.

1. *Assertions made by biblical critics.* The earliest history of Israel (Genesis, the age of the patriarchs) is, like that of all nations, a mass of legends; Moses is the first really historical personage to emerge from the obscurity of this legendary history. He gathered together some nomadic tribes of Arabian and Madianite origin, among whom memories of a former sojourn in Egypt still lingered, and he united them so as to form one people. He effected this by giving them as their national God a local deity named Jahve, who had been worshipped on Sinai from remote antiquity. There followed what may be called the heroic age of Israel (the time of the judges and earlier kings), but the individuals and their achievements are legendary.

The actual history of the Israelites begins with the conquest of Jerusalem by David, and his subjugation of all the Canaanite inhabitants of the country. At this time the worship of Jahve was by no means universal, for sacrifices were offered on many high places, and Solomon was the first to centralize the worship of Jahve by building a house in his honour. The older prophets lived about the time of this religious revival; they were men of high moral character, who purified the Jahve cultus and transformed it into a monotheism, emphasizing in particular its ethical side. (Ethical monotheism of the prophets.) The political division of the country into two kingdoms and the favour shown by Achab and Jezebel to Phoenician idolatry threatened to overthrow the worship of Jahve. In vain did the prophets utter warnings and admonitions. (Elias, the priests of Baal.) Their pessimistic feeling led them to proclaim that Jahve had abandoned His people and purposed to go to other nations and found a universal empire. In this way the deserted god Jahve developed first into a national and then into universal deity.

During the Captivity this "metamorphosis of the idea of God" was completed, as the downfall of their national life, and the oppression that they were suffering caused the Jews to cherish ardent hopes and aspirations for the future.

Before the southern kingdom perished the book of Deuteronomy was discovered (i.e., invented) about the year 622, in the reign of the pious King Josias; this was the beginning of Judaism, strictly so called, the religion of the Law. During the Captivity Judaism was more fully developed by the addition of Leviticus to the number of sacred books, and after the return of the Jews under Esdras and Nehemias it attained its full growth.

By means of an audacious forgery, unparalleled in the history of the world, the whole cultus, that really came into existence after the Captivity, was dated back into the period before it, and the Pentateuch, that had only just been compiled, was attributed to the time when the Israelites were wanderers in the desert. The books of Kings and Chronicles were written in accordance with this design, and the psalms, that had just been composed, were ascribed to King David. In other words, these critics believe the Pentateuch to have been written after the time of the prophets, and the psalms to belong to a period more recent that either the law or the prophets.

2. *Refutation of this criticism.* (*a*) This theory is a fanciful invention. It is at variance with the principles of historical research and the methods of honest inquiry. Everything in Holy Scripture that does not agree with this hypothesis is without any valid reason cast aside as legendary, fictitious, or as the result of later interpolations. The Pentateuch is said not to have existed at the time of the early prophets, and yet in the writings of Amos, Osee, Isaias, and Micheas there are references to the fall of Adam, Abraham, the destruction of Sodom, Jacob, the wanderings of the Israelites, Moses, and the written law, these references being so closely interwoven with the whole text that it is impossible to regard them as later interpolations. The later prophets, as well as Esdras and Nehemias, though they are regarded as men of high moral character, are yet supposed to have been guilty of gross falsifications in their own interest. Esdras, who was never in Egypt, is supposed to have written the Pentateuch, in spite of the fact that it contains a considerable number of passages bespeaking a most intimate acquaintance with Egyptian life and with the geography of the Sinaitic peninsula. The whole theory regarding the late origin of the Pentateuch stands confuted by the single fact that the Samaritans

possessed the books of Moses at least from the time of Nehemias onward, and probably much earlier. They were bitter enemies of the Jews and would never have accepted a fictitious work composed by a Jew.

(*b*) By confirming many historical statements in the Bible, and especially by establishing the antiquity of the book of Genesis, modern Egyptologists and Assyriologists have completely overthrown the historical and critical theory that we have been discussing and have proved beyond question the historical value of Holy Scripture.

(*c*) The only accurate part of the whole theory is that Esdras and his school collected the sacred writings that had long existed, but had been cut up into a number of fragments, and this task rendered a critical revision necessary. Their revision was, however, carried out on such strictly conservative lines that they did not attempt to reconcile two versions of one occurrence, but retained both, nor did they correct, but perpetuated difficult readings.

Bible and Babel. The recent discovery of cuneiform inscriptions (brick tablets from Tell el Amarna in Egypt, 1888) and the results of excavations at Babylon (code of King Hammurabi of Babylon, about 2250 B.C., 1901) have led Protestant theologians to put forward a fresh theory.

1. *The Babel-Bible hypothesis.* The traditions recorded in the book of Genesis and the Law of Moses are supposed to be historically trustworthy, but are not God's revelation, having been adopted from the civilization of the Babylonians. These people had traditions of the creation (the Gilgamesh epic), the fall of man (the Adapa legend, inscribed on a clay tablet), and the deluge; they knew of angels and devils, observed sabbath days, made sacrifices of atonement, and possessed penitential psalms. Hence it is maintained that in these respects the Bible is not the original, but a copy. Many features of the Mosaic Law occur also in the early Babylonian legislation; hence the former was not laid down by God. Professor *F. Delitzsch* was the first to propound these theories in two lectures on "Babel and Bible," delivered in Berlin in 1902 and 1903.

2. *Refutation of the Babel and Bible theory.* On comparing the Babylonian fragments with the Bible, we see unmistakably that the latter was written under God's guidance. It is not surprising that the Babylonians, being a Semitic people, retained a good deal of the old traditions of their race. Nor ought we to be astonished if isolated portions of the Mosaic Law came down from Abraham, formed part of the common Semitic tradi-

tion, and were incorporated by Moses in his code of divinely given laws. It would be strange were it otherwise. In Babylon these portions of tradition suffered much corruption and received a polytheistic wording, whereas under God's special protection they have been preserved to us in their monotheistic purity in Holy Scripture. For instance, among the Babylonians the sabbaths were the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days of the lunar month and were regarded as unlucky; their penitential psalms contain no allusion to contrition and amendment, but only to the avoidance of punishment. *J. Klug* writes on this subject (God's Word, p. 86): "Our conclusion is, therefore, that there are many muddy streams and only one pure source; and of this pure source of revelation one nation alone drank with reverence, namely, the Israelites, the chosen people of divine revelation, who were singled out from all other nations of the whole world, and were constantly supplied with fresh draughts of pure water by divinely inspired men."

Preparation for the Redeemer

The Old Testament revelation was incomplete both in its contents and its effect, nor was it finished once for all. It teaches the Jews to recognize the attributes of the one true God and the supernatural end of man. Yet it barely indicates several mysteries in the supernatural order (the Trinity, grace). It inculcates morality, but leaves man under the oppressive sense of unexpiated sin, from which the works of the law are powerless to free him; thus it awakens a longing for a Redeemer.

The inadequacy of the Old Testament dispensation to effect true atonement appears:

1. From the great number of prescribed religious observances, which shows that none of them had power to justify man and make him pleasing to God.

2. From the kind of advantages promised in return for the fulfilment of these legal obligations, such advantages being temporal and not spiritual.

3. From the kind of justification effected, inasmuch as it

was merely legal and outward, not inward. Even the offering of sacrifice, the most important action in the Jewish ritual, had no inward power of atonement. It was a recognition of God's supremacy, and expression of consciousness of guilt, and a means of awakening contrition.

The Old Testament revelation pointed to another more complete revelation and means of salvation.

A prophet was promised, who, like Moses, was to give a new law (Deut. xviii, 18); God pledged Himself to make a new covenant of fuller grace with His people (Jer. xxxi, 31–33); there was to be a new priesthood chosen out of all nations (Is. lxvi, 20, 21), a new sacrifice, pleasing to the Lord (Mal. i, 11), a new kingdom of God that should never be destroyed (Dan. ii, 44; Jer. iii, 17, 18; Is. lx, 3).

The old covenant was therefore "a shadow of things to come" (Col. ii, 17; Hebr. x, 1), and the law was a "pedagogue" to bring men to Christ (Gal. iii, 24).

Yet even before the coming of the Redeemer salvation was possible. Those who were saved could not indeed enter heaven before Him, but by means of the grace given them they could merit admission to His kingdom and enter it with Him when the work of redemption was completed. These graces were bestowed by God upon man in consideration of the Redeemer who was to come.

Nor were the Gentiles left unprepared for His coming:

1. God caused them to retain many truths of the primitive revelation.

2. God did not cease to lavish graces upon them in spite of their having forsaken Him.

Among these graces were natural benefits and many severe punishments; extraordinary men born in their midst or sent to them by God; intercourse with the Israelites, through whom

they gained a knowledge of Holy Scripture; angels, dreams, miraculous apparitions and events.

3. God allowed them to realize more and more the extent of their misery, so that they might long for delivery.

The sense of their own misery was aroused in the Gentiles:

1. By the frustration of their efforts to attain temporal happiness. Many ancient nations (Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans) reached a high degree of material and intellectual civilization, but were dissatisfied, because the standard of morality sank lower and lower and abominations of every kind abounded (debauchery, human sacrifices, and idolatry).

2. By the void left in their hearts in spite of all earthly pleasures. The high pitch of material civilization gave rise to luxury, love of amusement, and boundless effeminacy, ultimately, however, to weariness of life and a horror of existence.

The Expectation of the Redeemer

From the earliest times man had always looked forward to the coming of the Messias. This expectation was intensified as the time of His birth drew near and found expression amongst both Jews and Gentiles.

1. The Jews used to pray daily for the coming of "David's descendant." The theologians at *Herod's* court pointed out Bethlehem as His birthplace. The envoys sent from Jerusalem to John the Baptist asked: "Art thou he that is to come, or look we for another?" Simeon and Anna rejoiced to have seen and held in their arms Him who was the Light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of God's people Israel. The Samaritan woman said: "I know that the Messias cometh, . . . He will tell us all things." This sense of expectation accounts for the readiness of the people to throng around Jesus, the Messias, the Son of David, and at the same time it explains why false Christs found so many followers.

2. Amongst the Gentiles the original revelation regarding One who should destroy the serpent and overthrow the dominion of Satan lingered on in many legends. Zeus overcame the Titans, whose feet were serpents; Apollo killed the Python; and

Herakles slew the dragon guarding the Hesperides, the Lernaean Hydra and the savage Cerberus. In the same way Osiris fought against Typhon, Ormuzd against Ahriman, Vishnu against the dragon Rahu. In Scandinavian mythology Thor fought with Jörnungandr, the monstrous serpent, Freyr overcame the giant Beli, and Siegfried, Ornith, and Wolfdietrich followed their divine Master's example and resisted the dragon.

The Gentiles were acquainted with the Messianic prophecies current among the Jews. They turned their attention towards the east, whence the earnestly desired Saviour was to come.

Suetonius (Vespas., c. 4) writes: "Throughout the East an old and constant opinion was frequently expressed to the effect that men starting from Judea were destined at that time to acquire a world-wide supremacy."

Tacitus says (Hist., V, 13): "Many were convinced that it was written in the ancient books of the priests that at that very time the East should grow strong and men starting from Judea should acquire supremacy." Both these authors were referring to *Flavius Josephus* (de Bello Jud., VI, 5, 4). *Cicero* too remarks (de Divinitate, II, 54): "It has been announced in ancient prophecies that a king is to appear, to whom men must do homage, in order to be saved." Among the Greeks *Plato* gave utterance to this longing for a saviour, when he represented *Socrates* as saying that if any improvement were to be made in the existing state of the world, it could be effected only by means of a God who would reveal the beginning and type of justice.

III. THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

The Books of the New Testament

The New Testament contains the revelations made by Christ and the apostles. It consists of:

1. *The four Gospels,* written by *St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke,* and *St. John* respectively. These contain the story of Christ's life.
2. *The Acts of the Apostles,* by *St. Luke.*
3. *The Epistles,* fourteen of which were written by

St. Paul and seven by other apostles. These contain teaching on matters of faith and morals.

4. *The Apocalypse* or Revelation of St. John, foretelling the struggles and triumphs of the Church.

1. *Evangelium* signifies the good news of salvation manifested in Christ and proclaimed by the apostles. Originally people spoke of *one* gospel, meaning the doctrine preached by the apostles. When their oral teaching was written down, instead of using the singular and saying "the gospel according to Matthew, Mark, etc.," people used the plural and spoke of the gospels written by Matthew, Mark, etc. The four gospels are arranged according to their date of composition. *St. Matthew,* who was once a tax collector, wrote his gospel between 42 and 50 A.D. for the Christians in Palestine. About the same time *St. Mark,* a Jew from Jerusalem who was *St. Peter's* disciple and companion, wrote, at *St. Peter's* instigation, for the Christians in Rome. Some twenty years later (about 62 A.D.), and probably also in Rome, *St. Luke,* a physician from Antioch, wrote his gospel, deriving his information from *St. Paul,* who was at that time in prison. Finally, about the year 100, towards the end of his life, *St. John* the apostle compiled his reminiscences of our Lord's life, at the request of several bishops, and wrote with the express purpose of refuting those who denied the divinity of Christ.

The first three gospels deal more or less with the same subject matter, and at a very early period it was customary to write them in parallel columns, so as to form a synopsis. For this reason they are often called the synoptic gospels. The gospel of St. John is supplementary to the other three, with which it has only about a twelfth of its subject matter in common.

2. *The Acts of the Apostles* are a continuation of *St. Luke's* gospel and, like it, were written about 62 A.D. in Rome. They contain an account of the early Church in Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome, and deal fully with the history of *St. Paul.*

3. *The epistles.* (*a*) The fourteen epistles of *St. Paul.* The epistle to the *Romans:* Jesus, the Son of God, obtained salvation for all mankind by His death. Jews as well as Gentiles could be justified only through Him, and not through the Law of Moses, which was given only as a preparation for His coming.

The two epistles to the *Corinthians* are addressed to the Christian community established about the year 54 by *St. Paul* in

Corinth. These epistles contain serious warnings against paganism and sensuality. The epistle to the *Galatians* (a Keltic people in Asia Minor) was intended to prevent the Christians from being led astray by the Jews resident in that country, who wished them to adopt Judaism with Christianity.

The epistle to the *Ephesians* was written by *St. Paul* during his imprisonment in Rome. In it he describes to these converts from paganism their happiness in having been admitted to God's kingdom.

The epistle to the *Philippians* (in Macedonia) was written to thank the Christians in Philippi for the sympathy that they had shown to *St. Paul* in his captivity, and to encourage them to persevere in the faith.

The two epistles to the *Thessalonians* (in Macedonia) contain instructions regarding Christ's second coming, the last judgment, and the end of the world.

The epistle to the *Colossians* (in Phrygia) warns them against errors and also against relapsing into pagan vices.

The epistle to *Philemon,* a prominent Christian in Colossae, urges him to receive kindly a certain runaway slave named Onesimus, and to set him free for Christ's sake.

The three pastoral epistles, viz., two addressed to *Timothy* in Ephesus, and one to *Titus* in Crete, were written to guide these two disciples in the discharge of their duties as bishops.

(*b*) The seven epistles by other apostles are also called the Catholic epistles. They are:

The epistle of *St. James the Less,* in which the apostle insists that good works, as well as faith, are indispensable to salvation.

The two epistles of *St. Peter,* written in Rome (Babylon), are addressed to the Christians in Asia Minor and encourage them to be strong in faith and virtue.

The three epistles of *St. John* depict the Son of God appearing in human form for love of us and urge His followers to imitate His love of God and Man.

The epistle of *St. Jude Thaddeus* warns the Christians in Palestine against evil-minded opponents.

4. The Apocalypse of *St. John* consists of a series of prophetic visions relating to the future of the Church, the conflicts between Christ and His foes, both human and diabolical, and the end of the world.

The language of the New Testament is Greek. The gospel of St. Matthew, originally written in Hebrew, has been preserved only in a Greek translation.

The New Testament Greek exhibits the same Hellenistic features as the Greek portions of the Old Testament. The apostles and evangelists quote from the Greek version of the Old Testament. As the New Testament was written under the Roman Empire, it contains many Latin words and expressions. Hence the character of the New Testament Greek is in complete agreement with the time and place of its composition.

Authenticity of the New Testament

The books of the New Testament are genuine. We have both external and internal evidence in support of their authenticity.

A. *External evidence.*

1. The oral testimony of the earliest Christian communities, who received these books as the works of the apostles and continued to venerate and use them as such.

2. The written testimony of disciples of the apostles and of the earliest Christian authors.

3. The antiquity of still existing manuscripts of the original text and of the earliest translations.

1. The gospels, being the records of the apostles' preaching, and the epistles, addressed to various churches, were from the very beginning read at public worship. No one questioned their apostolic origin.

2. *Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp,* and other immediate disciples of the apostles, whose writings have come down to us, quote over five hundred passages from the New Testament. *Justinus,* their contemporary, calls the gospels "memorials" of the apostles. In the latter half of the second century *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian* state explicitly that the gospels were written by *St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke,* and *St. John* respectively, and make innumerable quotations from them.

Papias, writing about 138 A.D., says: "*St. Matthew* wrote the Logia of the Lord in the Hebrew language, and every man interpreted them as well as he could." *St. Clement of Alexandria* (about 200 A.D.) reports that "persons, who had heard *St. Peter* preach in Rome, begged *St. Mark* to write down for them the substance of his sermons, as he must know it by heart, having

for so long consorted with *St. Peter. St. Mark* complied with their wish. When *St. Peter* heard of it, he neither hindered nor encouraged *St. Mark*, but acknowledged the accuracy of what he had written and allowed it to be read in the church." *St. Irenaeus* (died 202) states that "*Luke*, a companion of St. Paul, entered in a book the gospel preached by him." *Justinus* (died 167) writes: "Afterwards [after the three others] *St. John*, the Lord's disciple, who even leaned on His breast, also wrote the gospel, whilst living in Ephesus."

The early heretics likewise appeal to the gospels, though they interpret them in their own way. *Celsus*, a pagan, who wrote about 120 A.D., made reference to "the writings of Jesus' disciples."

3. The original manuscripts of the New Testament, being in daily use, soon perished, as, in accordance with the fashion of the time, they were written on papyrus. During the persecutions the sacred books of the Christians were hunted and destroyed by their enemies, but nevertheless the earliest manuscripts go back to the fifth and even to the fourth century. The old Oriental translations are even older; there is still extant a Syriac manuscript belonging to the second century.

The writings of profane authors, whose authenticity is unquestioned, are all separated by a longer interval of time from their original manuscripts than is the case with Holy Scripture. *Vergil* died 19 B.C., but the earliest manuscripts of his works date from the fourth and fifth centuries. *Horace* died 8 B.C., and his earliest manuscripts belong to the eighth century, whilst of *Plato, Caesar,* and *Tacitus* there is nothing before the ninth century, of *Homer* and *Herodotus* nothing before the tenth century, and of *Sophocles* and *Aeschylus* nothing before the twelfth century.

B. *Internal evidence.*

1. They contain nothing contrary to the laws, usages, institutions, tastes, and customs of the time in which they are claimed to have been composed; they portray the religious and social state of Judea then prevailing with great accuracy and precise detail.

2. The vividness of the accounts shows the authors to have been ocular witnesses of the facts that they record.

3. The language is that of the first century.

1. Even in the period immediately following the age of the apostles, writings falsely ascribed to them were in circulation. We hear of gospels by *St. Peter, St. Thomas,* and *St. James,* Acta Petri, Barnabae, Philippi, an epistle addressed by *St. Paul* to the Laodiceans, and many others. These works, however, were rejected as apocryphal.

2. The Hellenistic or Alexandrine dialect of Greek is now known to us from other sources also; for instance from the papyri discovered at Memphis and from the Greek apocryphal books of the Old Testament. "The historical and critical labour of two generations has succeeded in restoring our belief in the historical character of the first three gospels, which *Strauss* fancied that he had disproved. The Greek language rests like a transparent veil over these writings, whose contents can easily be translated back into Hebrew or Aramaic. It is undeniable that we have before us here what is for the most part a primitive record." (*A. Harnack,* Wesen des Christentums.)

Integrity of the Text of the New Testament

The books of the New Testament have come down to us free from corruptions. The purity of the text is assured by:

1. The great reverence with which the sacred books have always been regarded in the Church.

2. The practice, that has prevailed from the earliest times, of reading them aloud at public worship.

3. Their rapid distribution to the various communities of Christians; any intentional alteration would have been easily detected, and an accidental error easily corrected.

The numerous quotations from the Bible that occur in the works of the Fathers and of Christian writers in the early centuries of the Church bear testimony to the purity of the text. Further evidence is supplied by ancient translations.

Trustworthiness of the New Testament

The books of the New Testament are trustworthy, for:

1. The authors were in a position to speak the truth, having actually witnessed the events that they described, or else (as in the case of *St. Paul* and *St. Luke*) having lived in close contact with eyewitnesses.

2. Their moral character is a guarantee of their sincerity and honesty. By their holy lives and miracles they proved themselves to be God's envoys, and they shed their blood in support of their testimony.

Their style bears the stamp of honesty and uprightness; they do not shrink from mentioning their own faults and frailties (*St. Peter's* denial, their jealousy of the sons of *Zebedee*). Their freedom from emotion and moderation in language prove the objectivity of their point of view. They describe our Lord's Passion without expressing any personal sympathy with Him or indignation at His judges.

3. They were compelled to speak the truth, since they wrote for contemporaries, many of whom had witnessed the events that they recorded, and these events had taken place publicly, in the course of several years, in every part of Judea and in the presence of thousands of people.

It seems impossible that the authors could have created out of their own imagination so superhuman a character as that of Christ or invented so exalted a doctrine as that contained in the gospels. "Shall we pronounce the story of the gospels to be an arbitrary fiction? My friend, people do not invent fictions of this sort; and the facts of *Socrates'* life, which no one questions, are less well attested than those of the life of Jesus Christ." (*Rousseau,* Emile, bk. IV.)

"In the first three gospels so much local colouring attaches to the figure of Christ, and His native language, Aramaic, is

everywhere so easily traced, that it would have been absolutely impossible for an Italian Greek of the second century to invent such a personality. Jesus is at home in Galilee and in real life, not at the Emperor's court, not in Rome during the second century, and not in the brain of some Hellenistic poet. His native place is near the sea, where the fishermen let down their nets, and on the mountains, where the lilies blossom and the wind rustles through the corn in the evening, and the little birds in the thickets sing the praise of their Creator; there Jesus was at home, there He really lived." (*Weinel,* Jesus in the Nineteenth Century, 1903.)

The New Testament and Infidel Criticism

1. *Christianity based on deception.* Professor *S. Reimarus* of Hamburg, a Protestant, who died in 1768, left a manuscript in which he depicted Christ as a man who aroused the hopes of the Jews for a political deliverance from the Roman dominion, and by unworthy means (pretended miracles, in which his disciples coöperated) represented himself as the Messias. The action of the government finally put an end to his activity.

2. *Christianity based on myths.* In 1835 *D. F. Strauss* published his "Leben Jesu, Kritisch bearbeitet," in which he represents the whole life of Christ, recorded in the gospels, as having been rewritten and expanded in the second century. *Ernest Renan* (1823–1892), in his "Vie de Jésus" (1863), depicts Christ as a Jewish fanatic of little education, who obtained considerable fame as a wandering rabbi by the aid of a number of followers, but finally abandoned his task in despair. As a religious hero *Renan* thinks that Christ deserves admiration.

3. *Christianity without Christ. Bruno Baur,* a private tutor at Berlin (died as a banker, 1882), went further still and declared that Christ never lived at all; that some "primitive evangelist" about the time of *Hadrian* (117–138) invented an ideal figure, by way of contrast to the degenerate Caesars in Rome (Christus und die Cäsaren, Berlin, 1878); the gospels now extant are, according to *Baur,* revised versions of the work of this first evangelist. Quite recently *Baur's* theory has been put forward again in another form by *Maurenbrecher,* a socialist, *von Steck* in Berne, *Kalkhoff* in Bremen, *Drews* in Carlsruhe, *Roberts, J. M. Thompson,* and *Dr. Cheyne.*

4. *Christianity, a religion produced by natural growth.* Modern biblical critics (*A. Harnack, R. Pfleiderer,* etc.) admit the historical character of the New Testament, but in an arbitrary

manner divide its contents into what is original and what is of later date. In order to get rid of the supernatural and miraculous element in the gospels, they assume that a primitive or original gospel once existed, but now is lost; or else they suppose each gospel, as we now have it, to be the result of a revision of an earlier version, so that there was an original gospel of St. Matthew, an original gospel of St. Mark, and so on. In the subsequent revisions the Church displayed her tendency to idealize and dogmatize. According to this hypothesis, the historical Christ, who, "in consequence of some psychologically inexplicable mystery, felt Himself to be the Son of God and the Messias" (*A. Harnack*), must be distinguished from the "dogmatic Christ," who even in the primitive Church was believed to be really the Son of God. It is the task of modern scholars who have received a scientific training to rid Christianity of its "dogmatic constituents" and to develop it in its original sense in a manner conformable to the present time.

Under the influence of Protestant critics a few Catholic theologians (*Loisy* in France, *Tyrrell* in England, and *Murri* in Italy) maintain that there has been a development of religion, and that dogma has not an absolute, but only a relative validity, determined by the view taken in any given period. This false doctrine, known as Modernism, was condemned by *Pius X* in his Encyclical Pascendi, dated September 8, 1907.

5. *Refutation of these hypotheses.* The theories of the earlier critics are contrary to the principles of historical research, philology, and psychology. The weakness of their arguments is apparent from the fact that one theory displaced the other after it had hardly been put forward. Their principle would not only undermine the veracity of the gospels, but would actually destroy all historic truth and reduce it to deception or legend. These theories are now discredited, but they continue to affect popular literature.

The refined and scientifically elaborated infidelity of modern critics is not the outcome of genuine research, but has a common origin with the coarser infidelity of earlier writers, viz., a dread of the miraculous. It cannot in the least disprove the clear evidence in support of the authenticity, trustworthiness, and textual purity of the New Testament; it is unable to account for the person and work of Christ or for the existence of Christianity, and it must regard these things as insoluble problems.

Undeniable evidence of the trustworthiness of the New Testament is supplied by the historical growth

of Christianity, which is based upon the facts and doctrines recorded in these books. There can be no doubt that Christianity originated in the first century of the Christian era, and consequently the facts to which it owes its origin must have taken place at the time and in the manner stated in the New Testament.

Isolated facts mentioned in the New Testament are alluded to by Jewish and pagan authors. It is easy to explain why pagan literature contains fewer references to Christ than we might expect. Ancient historians did not, as a rule, pay much attention to intellectual movements, and neither Jews nor pagans had any idea of the world-wide significance of Christ's teaching. The pagan scholars who studied Christianity were converted and are reckoned as Christian authors; to this class belong *Quadratus, Justinus, Aristides,* and *Clement* of Rome. There is an allusion to the massacre of the Innocents at Bethlehem in *Macrobius,* Saturnalia, II, 4, c. 11 (fourth century): "When he [i.e., *Augustus*] heard that the Jewish king *Herod's* own son had been one of the infants under the age of two years, who had been killed by *Herod's* order in Syria, he exclaimed: 'I would rather be *Herod's* pig than his son.'" *John the Baptist* is mentioned by *Flavius Josephus* (ob. 93 A.D.): "*John,* surnamed the Baptist, was killed by *Herod,* although he was an honest man, and simply exhorted the Jews to practise virtue, to live in justice among themselves and in the fear of God, and then to purify themselves by means of baptism." *Josephus* gives a detailed account of *Pontius Pilate.* The same work contains a famous passage on the subject of Christ (op. cit., XVIII, 63); some critics think that it shows traces of having been retouched by a Christian, but others consider that it is written quite in *Josephus'* usual easy, eclectic style. It runs as follows: "There lived about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be right to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works and a teacher of such as receive the truth gladly. He drew to himself many Jews and even many Gentiles as his followers. He was the Christ, but nevertheless *Pilate,* at the instigation of the principal men of our nation, condemned him to die on the cross, yet those who had previously loved him, did not forsake him. On the third day he appeared to them alive again. This and innumerable other wonderful things concerning him had been announced

by divinely inspired prophets. The sect of Christians, named after him, still continues to exist." [1]

Suetonius (81–138), in his life of *Claudius*, c. 25, says: "As the Jews, at the instigation of *Chrestus*, were continually causing disturbances, he [*Claudius*] banished them from Rome." It is generally assumed that this statement refers to Christ and His followers, but some few critics suppose that *Chrestus* was a freedman who stirred up the Jews to revolt. (See *Belser*, Einleitung in das N. T., p. 518.)

Flavius Josephus records the death of *St. James the Less:* "He [i.e., the high-priest *Ananias*] called a meeting of the Sanhedrin and presented to it the brother of Jesus, who is called Christ [his name was *James*] and some others, bringing against them charges of having transgressed the law, and he caused them to be stoned."

In the life of *Nero, Suetonius* (Nero, c. 16) mentions the first persecution of the Christians: "Under him [*Nero*] the death penalty was inflicted upon the Christians, a set of people who uphold a new and ruinous superstition."

Tacitus refers more fully (Annal., XV, 44, written about 115 A.D.) to the rumour that *Nero* himself had ordered Rome to be set on fire, and says: "In order to put an end to this insinuation, *Nero* threw the blame upon the Christians — as the people called these persons who were detested on account of their evil deeds — and inflicted upon them the most severe punishments. The name is derived from Christ, who was put to death by the procurator *Pontius Pilate* during the reign of *Tiberius*. For the moment his disastrous superstition was suppressed, but it broke out again and spread, not only over all Judea, the original home of the evil, but also to Rome, where in fact from every direction all imaginable abominations and horrors accumulate and find adherents."

Dion Cassius (Hist. rom., 67, 4, written about 190 A.D.) speaks of the second persecution under *Domitian*, and says: "Both [*Flavius Clemens* and *Flavia Domitilla*] were accused of despising the gods, for which reason others also, who adopted the

[1] This passage occurs in every manuscript of *Josephus* and is mentioned by *Eusebius* (ob. 340; Hist., I, 11 and Demonstr. evang., 3, 3). There seems to be no reason for believing it to have been interpolated by a Christian, in the interests of Christianity, and it would be strange if *Josephus*, writing about the year 90, had said nothing as to the origin of the Christian religion, that at his time was widely spread.

Jewish customs, were condemned; some were put to death, others suffered at least the loss of their property."

In an official correspondence with the Emperor *Trajan* in 111 A.D. the younger *Pliny*, who was governor of Bithynia, reports "that the superstition [of the Christians] has spread everywhere, not only in towns and villages, but also in the country," and that "at daybreak people assemble to sing praises to Christ as God."

Primitive Text and Translations of Holy Scripture

The original manuscripts of the Old and the New Testament no longer exist, but by the action of Divine Providence the text has always been copied with the greatest care, and very many ancient manuscripts have come down to us. It is true that in some places there are variant readings, such as occur in all works preserved in manuscript, but these are unimportant and do not affect the historical and dogmatic contents of the Bible.

1. The earliest known manuscripts of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament date from the ninth and tenth centuries. They all contain the text of the so-called Masorah, a critical revision, made by learned Jews in the sixth or seventh century A.D. In order to preserve the sacred books from mistakes due to future copyists, the Masoretes counted the verses, words, and letters of each book and noted how often each letter of the alphabet occurred. They determined which was the middle verse, the middle word, and the middle letter of each book, and they pointed out any unusual forms.

2. The earliest manuscripts of the Greek version of the Old Testament and of the New Testament go back as far as the fourth century. The most important of them are:

(*a*) The *Codex Sinaiticus* (S or Aleph), fourth century, now in Petrograd; it contains all the New and almost the whole of the Old Testament in Greek. In 1844 *C. Tischendorf* rescued forty-three pages of it from the waste-paper basket in the

convent of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai, and in 1859 he obtained permission to take away the greater part for his own use; in 1869 the monks presented the book to *Alexander,* Emperor of Russia.

(*b*) The *Codex Vaticanus* (B), fourth century, now in Rome, contains the whole Bible in the Greek language.

(*c*) The *Codex Alexandrinus* (A), fifth century, has been in London since 1628. It contains the whole Bible in Greek.

(*d*) The *Codex Parisiensis* or *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus* (C), fifth century, now in Paris; it contains the greater part of the New and fragments of the Old Testament. It is a palimpsest, the original writing, now artificially restored, having been obliterated and the works of *St. Ephrem* written over it.

(*e*) The *Codex Cantabrigensis* or *Codex Bezae* (D), sixth century, contains the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles with a Latin translation. During the wars of the Huguenots it was stolen from a French monastery and came into the hands of *Theodore Beza,* a Swiss reformer, who in 1581 presented it to the University of Cambridge. As *Irenaeus* and other Fathers of the second century give quotations that agree with the text of this Codex, it appears to be a copy of a very early manuscript.

The chief early translations of the Bible are the Septuagint, the Peshitto, the Itala, and the Vulgate. The *Septuagint* is a Greek translation of the Old Testament, made by Jews in Alexandria about the year 300 B.C. The *Peshitto* is a Syriac translation of the whole Bible, dating from the first and second centuries of our era. The *Itala* is a Latin translation of certain books of the Old and the New Testament. It was begun in Africa in the second century. The *Vulgate* is a revised version of the Itala, made by *St. Jerome* at the request of Pope *Damasus* about the year 400, together with a new Latin translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. It is still used officially by the Church and was declared by the Council of Trent to be "authentic," i.e., dogmatically correct.

The *Septuagint* (LXX) was, according to Jewish tradition, the work of seventy-two scholars. The translation was made mainly for the Jews in Alexandria, but those in other countries and even in Palestine soon made use of it. The apostles employed it as well as the Hebrew text. We cannot ascertain in what language our divine Saviour used the Scriptures; in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv, 20) He undoubtedly read the text in Hebrew, but He probably expounded it in Aramaic. It was in Aramaic too that He uttered the words from the Psalms when hanging on the Cross. (Matth. xxvii, 46.) The Septuagint was known to pagan authors.

The *Peshitto,* i.e., the intelligible, contains the whole of the Old and of the New Testament. The earliest manuscript of the Syriac Pentateuch in London is dated 446. In 1892, in a monastery on Mount Sinai, an ancient Syriac translation of the gospels (Lewis codex) was discovered; it is supposed to belong to the second century.

The *Itala* survives only in fragments; it originated in portions, in various regions where Latin was spoken.

St. Jerome's Vulgate is an exact and beautiful translation, based upon very careful preliminary studies. Ever since the time of *Gregory the Great* (600 A.D.) it has been in universal use, and thus came to be called the *vulgata* (*versio*), i.e., the universal translation. It is the best of all.

Besides the translations mentioned above there are many others, the chief of which are: The Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, known as early as the second century and rediscovered in Damascus in 1616; it dates probably from the time when the Temple on Garizim was built. The translation made by *Aquilas* in the reign of *Hadrian,* that by *Theodotion* about 185, that by *Symmachus* about 190; the Coptic version, dating from the second and third centuries; the Ethiopian, dating from the fourth century; and the Gothic version made by *Ulfilas,* also of the fourth century — this is known as the *Codex Argenteus* and was originally at Werden on the Ruhr, but is now at Upsala. Of somewhat later date are the Armenian, Georgian, Slavonic, Arabic, and Persian translations, and as a rule they have come down to us only in more recent manuscripts.

Origen (born 185) compiled a monumental work, called the Hexapla, in which he collected the Greek versions current in his time and compared them with one another and with the Hebrew. A smaller edition of his work was known as the Tetrapla. Both were preserved in Caesarea and consulted by the scholars of that period, but they eventually perished, and only fragments of them

remain. That *Origen* undertook such a colossal task is a proof of the zeal with which Holy Scripture was studied even at a very early date.

No book in the literature of the whole world has been preserved with such care as the Bible.

CHAPTER VI

THE SON OF GOD

The Messianic Character of Christ

THE promised Redeemer is our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God. The name Jesus means Saviour or Redeemer and indicates our Lord's mission.

The angel said to Joseph: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." (Matth. i, 21.) On Christmas night the shepherds heard the glad tidings: "This day is born to you a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord." (Luke ii, 11.) Christ often spoke of Himself as the promised Saviour; He did so before *St. John's* disciples, to the Samaritan woman, and on other occasions. The second article of the Apostles' Creed describes our Saviour as *Jesum Christum, filium Dei unigenitum, Dominum nostrum.*

The Greek name Christus, in Hebrew Mashiach or Messias, means "anointed." Under the Old Dispensation prophets, priests, and kings were anointed with oil when entering upon their exalted offices, and were called "The Lord's anointed." Jesus is most particularly the anointed, since, being the promised Messias, He is at once our supreme prophet, priest, and king. (Acts iii, 22; Hebr. iv, 14; John xviii, 37.)

1. Jesus is our *prophet,* because He revealed to us the mysteries of God and taught us what to do in order to be saved.

2. Jesus is our *priest,* because He sacrificed Himself for us on the Cross and still daily offers Himself upon our altars; moreover He will be for ever our mediator and advocate in heaven.

3. Jesus is our *king,* because He founded the Church, a spiritual kingdom, of which He is the supreme Head. The anointing

indicates the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, in virtue of which His humanity was endowed with the greatest power and with the utmost fulness of grace. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, wherefore he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the contrite of heart." (Luke iv, 18.) "Jesus of Nazareth . . . God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power." (Acts x, 38.)

Jesus is called the only-begotten Son of God, because He, being the Second Person of the most holy Trinity, is the one, true Son of God, being of one nature and one essence with God the Father.

We too are called children of God, but, though we are really such, it is not by nature, since we are children adopted by grace. "To as many as received him, he gave power to be made the sons of God, to them that believe in his name." (John i, 12.)

Jesus Christ is called our Lord:

1. As God, being one with the Father, and like Him Lord of heaven and earth.

2. As Man, because in His human nature He redeemed us by His Blood, and in that human nature will one day be our Judge, and our King for ever.

The prophets did not merely in general terms foretell the Redeemer's coming, but they specified many details and circumstances thereof. They foretold particularly:

1. The date and the circumstances of His birth, His life, Passion, and death.

2. His resurrection and ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost.

3. The destruction of Jerusalem, the rejection of the Jews, and the conversion of the Gentiles.

4. The foundation, growth, and permanence of His Church.

The Redeemer was to come seventy weeks of years (490 years) after the return of the Jews from their Babylonian captivity

(Dan. ix, 24), when the sceptre was taken away from Juda (Gen. xlix, 10). A virgin should conceive and bear a son (Is. vii, 14), a legitimate branch of David (Jer. xxiii, 5), at Bethlehem Ephrata (Mich. v, 2), and to him the kings of Tharsis and the islands should offer gifts (Ps. lxxi, 9). Then should the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf be unstopped (Is. xxxv, 5), and He would heal the contrite of heart (Is. lxi, 1). He was to come riding upon an ass (Jach. ix, 9) and to be sold for thirty pieces of silver (Zach. xi, 12), rebuked and spat upon (Is. l, 6), and given gall and vinegar to drink (Ps. lxviii, 22). His hands and feet were to be pierced, His garments divided, and lots cast for His vesture (Ps. xxi, 17, 19). Yet He was not to see corruption (Ps. xv, 10), but to ascend on high (Ps. lxvii, 19), and His sepulchre should be glorious (Is. xi, 10). He should pour out His spirit upon all flesh (Joel ii, 28) and establish a kingdom that shall never be destroyed (Dan. ii, 44), but the children of Israel would be left without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without altar (Osee iii, 4).

These prophecies are very convincing; they were uttered centuries before the birth of Christ and preserved in the sacred books of the Jews; they were known long before our Lord's coming in countries far away from Judea, and they were all exactly fulfilled.

The time of the prophets lasted about four hundred years, from 800 to 400 B.C. The last prophet before *John the Baptist* was *Malachias,* who lived about 450 B.C.

Christ and the apostles supplied the Jews with irrefutable evidence from the writings of the prophets that the Messias had come and that Jesus of Nazareth was Himself the Messias, because in Him all these prophecies were fulfilled.

"Search the scriptures," said Jesus to the Jews, "for you think in them to have life everlasting, and the same are they that give testimony of me." (John v, 39.) He convinced the incredulous disciples by referring to the prophets. (Luke xxiv, 25, 27, 44–47.)

By quoting prophecies *St. Peter* converted first three thousand and then five thousand persons. (Acts ii, iii.) *St. Paul* declared

before *King Agrippa* that he witnessed "both to small and great, saying no other thing than those which the prophets and *Moses* did say should come to pass." (Acts xxvi, 22.) The evangelists constantly refer to the fulfilment of prophecies, and of *Apollos* too we are told that "with much vigour he convinced the Jews openly, showing by the scriptures that Jesus is the Christ," i.e., the promised Messias. (Acts xviii, 28.)

In Jesus of Nazareth all the types were realized which in past ages had foreshadowed the actions and sufferings of the Messias.

1. Types of His sufferings and death: Abel, Isaac, Joseph, David; the Paschal lamb, the propitiatory sacrifice, the brazen serpent.
2. Type of His priesthood: Melchisedech.
3. Type of His prophetic and mediatorial office: Moses.
4. Type of His resurrection: Jonas in the whale.
5. Types of His Church and the Sacraments: the ark (the Church), the Red Sea (Baptism), the Manna, and the Temple with all its arrangements and sacrifices.

The Divinity of Jesus Christ

Jesus Christ is God; this is proved:

1. By the utterances of the prophets.
2. By the testimony of His heavenly Father.
3. By His own testimony.
4. By the teaching of the apostles.
5. By the teaching of the Catholic Church.

The prophets repeatedly declared that the future Redeemer would be God.

Isaias calls Him Emmanuel, i.e., "God with us" (vii, 14), and says: "God Himself will come and will save you" (xxxv, 4). Daniel speaks of Him as "the Saint of saints," and Jeremias says: "This is the name that they shall call Him, the Lord (Jahve) our just one" (xxiii, 6).

At our Saviour's baptism in the Jordan, and at His transfiguration on Thabor, His heavenly Father bore

testimony to Him, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." (Matth. iii, 17; xvii, 5.)

The word "Son" is here to be taken literally, not figuratively; this is apparent both from the wording itself and from the interpretation put upon it by the apostles, who spoke of Christ as "the true God" and as "God, blessed for ever."

Christ Himself bore witness that He is the Son of God, and true God as is His Father.

1. He spoke of Himself explicitly as the Son of God.

Caiphas said to Jesus: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us if thou be the Christ the Son of God." Jesus saith to him: "Thou hast said it." . . . Then the high priest rent his garments, saying: "He hath blasphemed." (Matth. xxvi, 63–65.) The Jews said to *Pilate:* "We have a law, and according to the law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." (John xix, 7.) When *Peter* said: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," and when *Thomas* exclaimed: "My Lord and my God," our Saviour corroborated their statements and sanctioned their belief.

2. He ascribed to Himself divine attributes and spoke of Himself as being one with the Father.

"What things soever the Father doth, these the Son also doth in like manner. . . . For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom he will, . . . that all men may honour the Son as they honour the Father." (John v, 19, 21, 23.) "All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine." (John xvi, 15.) "He that seeth me, seeth the Father also." (John xiv, 9.) "I and the Father are one. . . . Believe that the Father is in me, and I in the Father." (John x, 30, 38.) "Amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am." (John viii, 58.) "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." (John xiv, 6.)

3. He required all men to believe in His divinity.

"He that believeth in him [the Son] is not judged; but he that doth not believe is already judged, because he believeth not in the name of the only-begotten Son of God." (John iii, 18.)

4. He required all men to honour Him as God.

He asks for absolute confidence: "You believe in God, believe also in me." (John xiv, 1.) He asks for supreme affection: "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me." (Matth. x, 37.) He claims the same adoration as the Father: "That all men may honour the Son, as they honour the Father. He who honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent Him." (John v, 23.)

When Christ speaks of Himself as Son of God, it is not in the pagan sense of representing Himself as one of the gods (as *Caligula, Heliogabalus,* and others did), nor is it in the pantheistic sense of describing Himself as a manifestation of God, nor in the general sense in which every just man may be called a child of God. Our Saviour described Himself as the only-begotten Son of God, being one with the Father.

The Divinity of Christ, Proved by His Sanctity

Christ's testimony is confirmed by:
1. The sanctity of His life.
2. The exalted character and force of His doctrine.
3. His miracles and prophecies.
4. His death and His resurrection.

The sanctity of Jesus is revealed:

1. *In His perfect sinlessness.* There is no taint of evil attaching to His life, nor the least trace of any moral weakness or imperfection.

1. The disciples, who in their daily intercourse with our Lord must have known Him very intimately, speak of Him as "a lamb, unspotted and undefiled" (1 Peter i, 19), "the just" (1 Peter iii, 18), the one "in whom there is no sin" (1 John iii, 5). Judas, to whose interest it would have been to justify his treachery by pointing out some defect in his Master's character, was forced to confess that he had sinned in betraying innocent blood. (Matth. xxvii, 4.)

2. The Pharisees, our Lord's enemies, watched Him closely (Mark iii, 2; Luke vi, 7, xiv, 1), but never succeeded in discovering anything wrong in His actions. When scheming to secure His condemnation to death, they could bring forward nothing

against Him except slanders and misrepresentations of His teaching. Hence *Pilate*, whilst willing to condemn Jesus, refused to be responsible for "the blood of this just man" and washed his hands in token of his own innocence.

3. Christ Himself never betrayed the slightest consciousness of sin; without fear of contradiction He asked: "Which of you shall convince me of sin?" (John viii, 46.)

2. *In the variety of His virtues.* He possesses all virtues in the great perfection and in the highest degree. He is far above all the ideals of the ancients and all morally great men of any age.

1. Particularly conspicuous are His perfect charity towards God and man, His zeal for God's honour and for man's salvation, His obedience to His heavenly Father, His humility, gentleness, and patience. In speaking to *Cornelius*, the centurion at Caesarea, *St. Peter* sums up the life of Christ in the words: "He went about doing good." (Acts x, 38.)

2. In our Lord there is a wonderful harmony between His ceaseless outward activity and His inner recollection; He was full of mercy and tenderness, but combined with them strength and severity; He sympathized with every form of suffering, without, however, swerving from perfect justice, and He displayed at the same time most intense hatred of sin and tender love for sinners. None of the ideal heroes of antiquity can in any way be compared to Him. "How blind must any one be who ventures to compare the son of *Sophroniscus* [*Socrates*] to the Son of Mary!" (*Rousseau*, Emile.)

3. *In the perfection of His character.* He towers aloft as the ideal of the human race, far beyond His own time, surroundings, and nation.

Jesus is the model for mankind in general, with no distinction of age, nationality, degree of education, rank, or sex; He is at the same time the object of our deepest veneration and of our most loving confidence.

4. *In the exalted character of His aim.* He came to bring salvation to mankind and by His words, works, and death to redeem all descendants of Adam.

"The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost." (Matth. xviii, 11.) "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." (Luke xix, 10.)

The sanctity of Jesus Christ is manifested in the incomparable dignity of His outward appearance and in the impressive simplicity of His actions.

1. "All that heard Him were astonished at His wisdom." (Luke ii, 47.) "They were astonished at His doctrine, for His speech was with power." (Luke iv, 32.) "The people were in admiration at His doctrine, for He was teaching them as one having power, and not as their scribes." (Matth. vii, 28, 29.) "Never did man speak like this man." (John vii, 46.) "No man laid hands on Him." (John vii, 30.) "They took up stones therefore to cast at Him, but Jesus hid Himself and went out of the Temple." (John viii, 59.) The centurion standing by the Cross exclaimed: "Indeed this was the Son of God." (Matth. xxvii, 54.)

2. In carrying out His great work, Christ never had recourse to human ingenuity or assistance. He simply asserted His divinity and emphasized the great truths of His doctrine by the words: "Amen, amen, I say unto you." His kingdom is to extend to the furthest parts of the world and to last for ever, but in founding it He dispensed with all external force and the resources of human learning. He Himself, "the carpenter's son," and His apostles, who were Galilean fishermen and publicans, effected the greatest revolution that has taken place in the history of the world.

Whoever, contemplating the personal majesty and life of Christ, refuses to confess that in Him God appeared visibly to men, is confronted by the figure of Jesus Christ as by an eternal problem that he cannot solve, whilst he is forced to admit that this figure is the central point in the world's history.

"In the fulness of time Christ appeared as the final, supreme revelation. His entrance into our earthly existence was wonderful; the course of His life was wonderful, and so was its end; He is the greatest and noblest phenomenon that ever appeared on earth. From the depths of His humiliation and the darkness of His sufferings shine forth brightly an indescribable greatness

and majesty; from His poverty and misery flashes out a high and holy dignity such as has never been seen elsewhere and such as no human imagination in its highest flights could ever picture. What strikes us most in Jesus Christ, and what forms the unchanging background against which His figure stands out in all its majesty and brightness, is the union of all those characteristics that an intelligent mind would select in trying to describe the Godhead. Truth, transparent as the sun's rays, sanctity, pure as light itself, justice, penetrating to the lowest depths of the soul, and love, aiming at and desiring nothing so much as to impart mercy, grace, peace and salvation — this is God, and all this was in Jesus Christ. Yes, indeed, if we had no idea of God, we should think of Him as resembling Jesus. If there is a God, His divinity must have shone forth in Jesus, since He is the visible image of the Invisible, the power and wisdom of the Father, and the reflection of His eternal majesty." (*Walter.*)

"He [Christ] presented the rare spectacle of a life, so far as we can estimate it, uniformly noble and consistent with his own lofty principles." (Author of "Supernatural Religion.")

"It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which, through all the changes of eighteen centuries, has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, and conditions; has been not only the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice; and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and all the exhortations of moralists." (*Lecky,* History of European Morals.)

The Divinity of Christ, Proved by His Teaching

Christ's teaching is characterized by a sublimity far surpassing all human wisdom and by a force such as the doctrines of no philosopher and the founder of no other religion ever possessed.

The sublimity of Christ's doctrine is manifest:

1. *In His teaching regarding faith.* Our Lord gives exhaustive information on the subject of God's nature and attributes, the reverence due to God, the duties of

man, the expiation of guilt, and the means of reaching our final aim. The lucidity and simplicity of His teaching equal its sublimity, and it is as well adapted to a child's powers of comprehension as to the acumen of a philosopher.

In comparison with the teaching of Christ all the legends of pagan mythology and *Mahomet's* fables appear childish and ridiculous.

2. *In His teaching regarding morals.* (*a*) Christ is not satisfied with external good works, He demands inward renewal and sanctification. Yet He is full of tenderness, He never rejects a sinner, but tries to lift him up and sanctify him.

(*b*) By setting us an example and giving us helping grace Christ supplies us with noble motives and powerful assistance in the practice of virtue. In the Evangelical Counsels Christ's moral teaching is the sublimest expression of ethical heroism.

"Christ's teaching affects the whole inward and outward existence of the individual, the family, and the state; it reaches all conditions — the sinner, the penitent, the innocent, the just, and the saint; it is adapted to every rank, age, and sex; it controls all the relations of life; it contains and discloses the mysteries regarding the origin of man, his guidance by Divine Providence, and his final end, as well as those of grace, justification, sanctification, and salvation; in short it embraces the entire universe, heaven and hell, time and eternity." (*Patiss,* Life of Christ, p. 247.)

Kant acknowledges that reason would not yet perceive the laws of universal morality unless it had learnt them from Christianity.

"We boast," says *Rousseau,* "of our present morality and ascribe it to the progress made by philosophy, but this morality was Christian before it was philosophical." (III lettre de la Montagne.)

"Criticism," writes *D. Strauss,* "in dealing with religion not only assigns to the heroes of Christianity a higher position than

to those of any other creed, but acknowledges frankly that to surpass Jesus in matters of religion, and consequently in the highest interests of life, is, once for all, impossible."

Even *Goethe* says: "Whatever intellectual progress is made, whatever development is attained by science, and to whatever heights the mind of man may soar, it will never be possible to rise above the dignity and morality of Christianity, as presented to us in the gospels." (Gespr. mit Eckermann, III, p. 171.)

Undogmatic Christianity. 1. The liberty, claimed by the so-called reformers, to interpret Holy Scripture in accordance with their own private judgment has caused some Protestant theologians to deny all that is dogmatic in the gospels. They maintain that Jesus propounded no dogmas, but that moral teaching constitutes the essence of Christianity. Dr. *Dreyer, Peabody,* and others thought that it might be possible to bring all Christian denominations together and unite them on the basis of this undogmatic Christianity. "Among enlightened Protestants there is a strong sense of separation from other Christians. They are not inclined to burden themselves with the traditions of European religion, and class the pope, the czar, *Luther,* and *Calvin* all together, whilst they realize their own aloofness from Christianity as it now is. To Protestants of this type all the old ideas have lost their original signification, in fact they have no intelligible meaning at all; creation has become evolution, the fall of man is the state of nature, God is the universal spirit, providence the force or purpose of the universe or something similar. The soul is identified with consciousness, heaven is a vague and colourless state after death, resurrection is at best a continued existence, the kingdom of God is moral progress, prayer is interior recollection, and the sacraments are symbolical actions. To some extent every one of us has experienced this distortion of the old ideas, whereby they are deprived of their former meaning, but let us not be deceived on one point: in proportion to the total number of Christians in the world, those who feel the old ways of thought to be breaking down are still few, and, what is more important, weakness has not in itself any power to gain adherents. . . . For this reason the old, hard and fast views are still stronger than all the attenuated varieties of them, and it is therefore, in my opinion, a great mistake seriously to propose the formation of a new religious body. We are bound fast to the old, having nothing to substitute for it." (*Fr. Naumann,* Briefe über Religion, p. 15.)

The Eighteenth Congress of German Protestants, held at Gotha in 1890, passed the following resolution in favour of un-

dogmatic Christianity: "We deprecate any attempt to impose upon our generation the old dogmas as laws of faith and doctrine. . . . The firm foundation, on which we have unanimously taken up our stand, is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which existed before any dogmas and possesses a wealth of religious and moral life."

2. Every page of the New Testament, from the account of the miraculous birth of our Lord to that of His glorious ascension, contradicts the assertion that it was not the aim of the gospel to inculcate definite truths. Christ invariably established His doctrine with calm authority, befitting the infallible knowledge of the Son of God. For instance, in the simple words of the baptismal formula He taught the doctrine of the Trinity; He proclaimed His dignity as the Messias when He said to the Samaritan woman: "I am he who am speaking with thee"; He revealed His divinity in the words "I and the Father are one," and His real presence in the most holy Sacrament of the altar by declaring: "This is my Body." He frequently stated that faith in Him and His word was the reason why He healed the sick. He demanded unconditional faith of His disciples, as He showed by asking: "Will you also go away?" after speaking of the Blessed Sacrament in the synagogue at Capharnaum. The sentence "The firm foundation on which we stand is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which existed before any dogmas" is therefore as devoid of meaning as would be a statement, on the part of an architect, that he stood on the firm foundation of an arch that existed before any of the stones of which it was built.

The alleged defects of Christian ethics. 1. In order indirectly to attack the divinity of Christ many infidels have attempted to discover defects in His ethical teaching. *David Strauss* thinks that it contains no reference to the virtues of domestic and family life nor to those displayed in warfare or in politics. He considers that Christ undervalued marriage and paid no attention to industrial conditions. *Pfleiderer* imagines our Lord to have insisted upon the abandonment of private property, of professional occupations, and of family life. *Paulsen* maintains that Christ required patient endurance rather than courage and did not appreciate a vigorous sense of justice that neither inflicts nor tolerates a wrong. His ethical teaching is supposed to be deficient with regard to the intellectual virtues, the audacity and freedom of thought, and the spirit of inquiry which lie at the root of all scientific progress. Moreover it is too unworldly, and ignores the value of and our right to the enjoyment of life. Others object to the "heteronomy" and desire for rewards that

form part of Christian ethics. *Nietzsche* goes, as usual, to extremes, and because Christianity inculcates sympathy with the weak and afflicted, he calls it "slavish" and "more infamous than any vice." In his opinion humility, chastity, poverty, and sanctity have done infinitely more harm than any crime.

2. The alleged defects in Christ's ethical teaching appear to be non-existent, if we look at the effects of His doctrine. All those virtues which infidel critics consider lacking in the gospel have been promoted by its agency. Domestic and family life, progress in economics and science, all, in short, that tends to raise the individual and to civilize society, is the result of Christian morality.

It is easy to refute the various arguments against Christ's ethical teaching. The above-mentioned "defects" are defects, not in His doctrines, but in men's comprehension of these doctrines. In order to fathom the full depth of the gospel it is not enough to read it critically, but it is necessary to accept the teaching and example of Jesus in a spirit of faith and to strive to carry it out in practice. Hence neither the zealous Christians of the early Church nor the mystics of the Middle Ages discovered defects in the gospel; such a discovery was reserved for modern infidelity.

Jesus is accused of undervaluing the domestic virtues, and yet He spent the thirty years of His hidden life in the practice of them. Even on the Cross He was still mindful of His duty to His Mother. In the parables of the Prodigal Son and of the father who does not offer a stone to his hungry child, in the midst of the little children whom He suffered to come to Him, and in the house of Lazarus, our Lord showed His respect for the virtues of family life. He is accused of undervaluing marriage, and yet He raised it to the rank of a sacrament and worked His first miracle at the marriage feast in Cana. He is said to have ignored industry, and yet its rights and duties are stated most plainly in the parables of the talents, of the workers in the vineyard, and of the steward who was called to give an account of his stewardship. By way of contrast we have the picture of the Prodigal Son, who is so called precisely because he was extravagant and unwilling to work. Jesus is said not to have insisted upon fidelity to one's calling, and yet in His parables He represented all sorts of occupations as honourable and He worked miracles for people of every class, including publicans and Roman officers. It was Christ who first consecrated labour by connecting it with future rewards, as seed time is connected with harvest. "What things a man shall sow, those also

shall he reap." (Gal. vi, 8.) "He will render to every man according to his works." (Matth. xvi, 27.) Finally, Jesus displayed a vigorous sense of justice before *Annas*, when He protested against the unfair treatment that He received, and He showed the same spirit in His dealings with the Pharisees, the men who traded in the Temple, *Herod*, and *Pilate*.

3. It is true that Christ did not tell His apostles and disciples to glean knowledge from every possible source. How could He, being all wise, send them to pagans or Pharisees for instruction? Nor did He encourage them to seek enjoyment; on the contrary He taught them to deny themselves and take up their cross; He bade them bear poverty and persecution for justice' sake, despising worldly riches and striving after higher things. Jesus taught the true virtue that consists in renunciation of all that is base, and riches and enjoyment are not the normal means of acquiring this virtue; they are, on the contrary, beset with dangers, and therefore He warned His followers against them, without, however, condemning them in principle. Nothing but contempt of the world leads to true conquest of the world; nothing but self-denial leads to self-control. He, the Creator of human nature, knew, as none else could know, the dangerous inclinations of the human heart, and His instruction was guided by this knowledge.

4. Ever since the time of *Kant* and *Fichte* men have spoken of an "autonomous morality," maintaining that only such actions have a moral value as express the self-determination of the individual, not such as are performed at the bidding of another or in obedience to God's commands. As Christian ethical teaching is based upon the will of the Father, i.e., another's law, it is heteronomous and therefore imperfect. This argument is the outcome of a failure to understand the relation existing between human reason and God's will. It is correct to say that a man must always act in accordance with his inner conviction or conscience, if his actions are to be morally good; but God's commandments are never opposed to the voice of conscience. As soon as a man's reason recognizes anything with certainty as commanded by God, in submitting to this commandment he is following his own conviction. Hence reason requires ethics to be heteronomous whenever there is any question of obedience to God or His representatives, such as parents or the Church.

5. It is absolutely unjustifiable to speak of Christian ethics as mercenary or utilitarian. To a Christian the supreme motive for moral action is love of God and his neighbour. God in His goodness has ordained that man in obeying the commandments

works out his own salvation, and by transgressing them brings about his own ruin; this must be so, for it is a logical result of God's justice. The motive of reward and fear exists, but it is subordinate to charity. "Perfect charity casteth out fear." (1 John iv, 18.)

6. *Nietzsche's* criticism is the outcome of morbid hatred and a symptom of that megalomania from which he suffered towards the close of his life. It was a striking disposition of Divine Providence that "the apostle of the ruthless dominion of the superman became at last as helpless as a child. Well was it for him that a 'slavish morality' still existed to take charge of the helpless invalid and nurse him in his weakness and misery." (*Grotthuss.*)

Christ's teaching was not derived from any human source, nor from the Mosaic or any other Oriental religion, nor from Greek and Alexandrine philosophy, as many rationalists have claimed. It came from the Father, with whom Christ is one.

Jesus studied in no school and sat at the feet of no master. The Jews were astonished at Him and asked: "How came this man by all these things? and what wisdom is this that is given him? . . . Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" (Mark vi, 2, 3.) "Is not this the son of Joseph?" (Luke iv, 22.) "How doth this man know letters, having never learned?" (John vii, 15.)

The force of Christ's teaching is manifested in the extraordinary effect that it had upon mankind.

1. It has won the hearts of men.

2. It has renewed and transformed the world.

3. It has brought happiness to all who honestly accept it.

1. The rapid propagation of Christianity is a miracle of the moral order. On the first Pentecost there were over three thousand believers, and after *St. Peter's* second sermon there were five thousand. Within thirty years after the ascension Christianity penetrated to every part of the Roman Empire and even beyond its boundaries. About the year 100 *Pliny*, the proconsul of Bithynia, reported to *Trajan* that the Christian "superstition"

was making astonishing progress in towns and country p
and in 200 A.D. *Tertullian* in his "Apology" addressed
pagans thus: "We are but of yesterday and yet have filled eve
place that you possess, cities, islands, fortresses, and townships.

The cruel persecutions that were ordered by the Roman emperors were as powerless as subsequent internal troubles to check the growth of Christianity; in fact they seemed rather to promote it, as *Tertullian* thought when he wrote: "The blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians."

2. Christianity has transformed the human race spiritually, morally, and socially. It has given birth to virtues previously unknown, such as love of God, submission to His will, humility, chastity, love of neighbours and enemies, etc. It has exerted a most beneficial influence upon social life, has secured universal recognition for the dignity of man (abolition of slavery and infanticide), has purified family life and raised the position of woman; by means of charitable institutions of every kind it has alleviated poverty and suffering, and it has created settled forms of government, secured the rights of nations, and even mitigated the horrors of warfare. It has indeed been the leaven permeating the whole of human society.

3. Christianity brings happiness, by satisfying our spiritual needs and answering the fundamental questions of life, which puzzle the mind of philosophers. It frees the human will from bondage to the lower passions and gives it strength to accomplish heroic deeds. Finally, it gratifies the craving, felt by the heart of man, for the supreme good, it is a powerful solace in all sufferings, and in every condition of life it imparts peace such as the world cannot give.

The Divinity of Christ, Proved by His Miracles

The miracles in our Lord's life may be divided into wonderful events and wonderful actions. Among the wonderful events we reckon His birth, transfiguration, and resurrection. Christ's active miracles affected nature, men, and spirits.

Miracles affecting nature were performed at the marriage feast in Cana, the multiplication of loaves, the stilling of the storm at sea, the draught of fishes, as well as when our Lord walked on the water and ascended in bodily form to heaven.

Miracles affecting human beings were wrought whenever our

healed the sick and gave sight to the blind and hearing to deaf. They were frequently performed from a distance and means of a word or a symbol. Still more important are the instances in which persons actually dead were raised to life. Three such miracles are recorded, increasing in magnitude: the daughter of Jairus was raised as she lay on her deathbed, the young man of Naim as he was being carried out to burial, and Lazarus after he had lain some days in the grave.

Miracles affecting spirits were wrought whenever evil spirits were driven out.

The reality of Christ's miracles cannot be questioned, since they took place in public, in the presence of hundreds or even thousands of witnesses, and were not challenged even by His enemies.

The evidence in support of the actual occurrence of these miracles has not been shaken by any of the theories put forward by unbelievers at different periods. The chief of these theories are:

1. *The delusion theory,* according to which Christ's miracles were natural occurrences, but to the credulity of the disciples and of the multitudes appeared supernatural. This theory is exploded by the simple nature of the events and by the number and character of the witnesses.

Christ's miracles were simple and easily recognized. The disciples were by no means credulous and eager to regard everything as miraculous (*Thomas,* the disciples at Emmaus). The miracles were attested by most highly educated Jews, as well as by the common people.

2. *The myth theory,* according to which the gospel miracles are myths, dating from the second century. This theory is overthrown by the fact that the gospels were written in the apostolic age.

David Strauss devised this theory, but it was subsequently given up by him and his followers, as they could not deny the

authenticity of the gospels after it had been established by scientific research.

3. *The deception or fraud theory,* according to which Christ and the apostles invented the reports of supposed miracles, in order to impress the people and attain their own political ends. This theory cannot be maintained by any one who studies the character and life work of Christ and His disciples.

1. The base suggestion made by *Reimarus* is totally opposed to the sincerity that characterized Jesus and His apostles. His work was thoroughly unpolitical, and it is, moreover, contrary to common sense to suppose that any one would suffer persecution, shame, and a most painful death for the sake of deceiving others.

2. The more recent assertion that Christ's miracles were worked by means of spiritism or hypnotism has been set aside in consequence of the unmasking of thaumaturgical spiritists. Unlike their miracles, those of Christ were wrought with no preparation, in broad daylight, in the open air, for good reasons, and never to satisfy mere curiosity; their results were permanent and visible to all.

Hypnotism can only cure certain nervous diseases in persons naturally susceptible to such treatment, but Christ cured every kind of disease by a word and the exercise of His will. If He occasionally touched the tongue, ears, or eyes of the sick, this action had only a figurative signification.

The Divinity of Christ, Proved by His Resurrection

The fact of the resurrection affords conclusive evidence of the divinity of Christ and of the divine origin of Christianity. Our Lord Himself spoke of His resurrection as the chief proof of His divine mission, and the apostles regarded it as their most important task to bear testimony to this fact. Thus, at the election of *Matthias, St. Peter* said: "Of these men who have companied with us . . . must be made

a witness with us of His resurrection." (Acts i, 21, 22.) In the same way *St. Paul* says to the Corinthians: "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain." (1 Cor. xv, 14.)

Jesus Christ really died. This is proved by:

1. His public execution following upon a death sentence.

2. The manner of His death, viz., crucifixion and a lance thrust.

3. The testimony of eyewitnesses.

"Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and saying this He gave up the ghost. (Luke xxiii, 46.)

1. The crucifixion took place in the ordinary administration of justice; it was officially carried out and verified.

2. Crucifixion caused such loss of blood as to be invariably fatal. The lance thrust, piercing the heart, was alone enough to cause death, but Christ was already dead, as was shown by the flow of water and blood.

3. The centurion on duty reported officially to *Pilate* that death had taken place, before the procurator gave orders that the body should be given to *Joseph* of Arimathea for burial. Thus the people in general, friends and enemies alike, were convinced that Jesus was dead. His friends wrapped the corpse in fine linen and laid it in a sepulchre.

Jesus Christ really rose again by His own power. His resurrection is most clearly attested by:

1. His apostles and disciples, who are trustworthy witnesses on account of their number, their honesty, and their spirit of self-sacrifice.

2. The behaviour of our Lord's enemies, whose actions were prompted by their knowledge of His resurrection.

1. There were many who bore witness to the resurrection. Our risen Saviour appeared sometimes to individuals, such as *Mary Magdalene, Peter,* the disciples at Emmaus, and after-

wards *St. Paul,* sometimes to large assemblies of people. On Easter Sunday He appeared to the ten apostles who were gathered behind closed doors; He was seen by seven apostles and disciples beside the Lake of Tiberias, by five hundred disciples on a mountain in Galilee, and by a still larger number at His ascension on the Mount of Olives.

These witnesses were trustworthy. *St. John* writes: "That . . . which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled . . . we declare unto you." (1 John i, 1, 3.) They were cautious and deliberate, and at first they regarded the report brought by the women as mere imagination, and decided to probe the matter and to believe only the unmistakable evidence of their own senses. *St. Thomas* actually said: "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the place of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe." (John xx, 25.) Rightly did *St. Gregory* the Great remark that the incredulity of *St. Thomas* has done more to strengthen our faith than the belief of the other apostles.

In support of their testimony the witnesses to the resurrection underwent tortures and losses, and even died the death of martyrs. After Christ's resurrection His timid disciples were completely transformed; they taught openly, in spite of the prohibition issued by the Sanhedrin, and were not deterred by scourging or imprisonment. Subsequently they went forth into other countries, preaching everywhere amidst dangers and sufferings, until they died rather than deny their risen Lord.

2. The behaviour of Christ's enemies shows that they believed Him to have risen. The soldiers who had kept guard near the sepulchre reported to the chief priests all the wonderful things that had taken place there, but the Sanhedrin refrained from holding any inquiry into the matter, and simply tried to bribe the men to say no more about it. The same thing was done again later; no one accused the apostles of spreading false reports, but every effort was made to silence them.

In order to undermine belief in the miraculous character of the resurrection, three attempts have been made to give a natural explanation of it; but it is easy to overthrow these hypotheses. They are:

1. *The hallucination hypothesis,* according to which the disciples, being in a state of morbid excitement,

were deluded into fancying that our Lord had appeared to them. There is no natural justification for this supposition.

The death of Jesus on the Cross could not suggest His triumph over death and the grave. The disciples were unwilling to accept the report of His resurrection and certainly did not encourage "visions"; their reluctance went so far as to make them fear that they were seeing a spirit (Luke xxiv, 38) when our Lord appeared to them, until He invited them to touch Him and to eat with Him. It would require a miracle to account for the continuance of such "visions" during forty days, in different places, under various circumstances, in the presence of hundreds of sane and simple people.

2. *The trance hypothesis,* according to which Christ was buried whilst in a trance, and, having recovered consciousness in the cool sepulchre, pushed aside the stone from the entrance and rejoined His companions. This theory is opposed to the fact that Christ really died, as well as to the wounds inflicted on His Body, and His disciples' enthusiasm.

Even *David Strauss* thought this view untenable, for he wrote: "Should a half-dead man, in urgent need of assistance, have issued from his grave, only to succumb in a short time, he could not possibly have made upon his followers the impression of a victor over death and the grave, and of the prince of life." Moreover it would have been a physical impossibility for any one to walk whose feet had been pierced with nails.

3. *The deception hypothesis.* The disciples had no reasonable motive for stealing the body, and they would have been unable to do so, as soldiers were guarding the sepulchre.

Our Lord's enemies devised this theory in their embarrassment, but, as they had themselves set the watch, they had deprived it of all force. *St. Augustine* rightly ridicules the idea of calling sleeping guards as witnesses to a theft. It is absurd to suppose that the disciples, who had nothing further to expect from their

dead Master, would have even desired to steal His Body at the risk of their own lives.

Nothing but the *fact* of the resurrection can account for the success attending the preaching of the apostles. After Christ's public execution and burial all faith in Him seemed to have vanished, and if, in spite of this, the apostles in a very short time induced thousands of Jews and Gentiles to believe in Him, they must themselves have been absolutely certain of His resurrection or they could never have convinced others of it. Otherwise it would be inexplicable why they and countless converts gladly suffered martyrdom for this fundamental truth of Christianity.

"If it was incredible that Jesus rose from the dead, it was still more incredible that the assertion of a few Galilean fishermen should have convinced the world of so incredible a fact, unless the resurrection had actually been a fact, and not merely a fiction and delusion." (*St. Augustine.*)

The Divinity of Christ, Proved by His Prophecies

The prophecies of Christ referred to His own person, His apostles, the fate of Jerusalem and of the Jewish nation, and the growth of His Church.

1. With reference to His own person Christ foretold the manner and time of His death, His resurrection, and His ascension.

"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be lifted up." (John iii, 14.) "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be betrayed to the chief priests and the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the gentiles to be mocked, and scourged, and crucified, and the third day he shall rise again." (Matth. xx, 18, 19.) "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." (John ii, 19.) "If then you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" (John vi, 63.)

2. With reference to His apostles Christ foretold that *Judas* would betray (John xiii, 21, 26), that *Peter* would deny and that the disciples would forsake Him (Matth. xxvi, 34; Mark xiv, 30; John xiii, 38), but that after His ascension they would receive the Holy Ghost and bear testimony to Him to the furthest ends of the earth.

3. With reference to Jerusalem and the Jewish nation Christ foretold the total destruction of city and Temple and the dispersion of the Jews among other races.

"There shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people, and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captives into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the gentiles, till the times of the nations be fulfilled." (Luke xxi, 23, 24.) *Julian* the Apostate wished to prevent this prophecy from being fulfilled, so he determined to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem by the agency of *Alypius* of Antioch. The Jews joyfully returned from all parts and undertook the work, removing the ruins of the old temple, so that not one stone was left on another. "But whilst *Alypius* was zealously carrying on the work with the assistance of the procurator, terrible flames issued again and again from the foundations, burning the labourers and making the whole place inaccessible. On account of the persistent opposition offered by this fire, the task was abandoned." This event is recorded by *Ammianus Marcellinus* (Hist., XXIII, 1, 2–3), a pagan who served in *Julian's* army. Similar accounts are given by *St. Gregory Nazianzen,* the historians *Sozomenus* and *Socrates,* the Jewish Rabbi *Gedalia,* and others. *St. John Chrysostom* addresses the Jews as follows (orat., 6): "Go to Jerusalem! you will see there the ruins of these foundations. Ask what caused them, and you will be told the same story as we have recorded. We all are witnesses of these occurrences, which took place in our own neighbourhood and not long ago."

4. With reference to the Church, Christ foretold that it would grow like the mustard seed and would act like leaven, transforming all mankind (Matth. xiii,

31, 33); that the gates of hell should not prevail against it (Matth. xvi, 18), and that the gospel should be preached in the whole world (Matth. xxiv, 14).

Christ's prophecies have partially been fulfilled, and we can still watch the fulfilment of others, and it affords incontestable evidence of His divine omniscience. Jesus Himself appealed to this evidence when He said to His disciples: "These things I have told you, that when the hour shall come, you may remember that I told you of them." (John xvi, 4; cf. Matth. xxiv, 25.)

The Divinity of Christ, Proved by the Apostles' Teaching

The apostles, who were Christ's companions and authorized to preach in His name, taught explicitly:

1. That Jesus is God.
2. That He possesses the whole fulness of the Godhead.
3. That all creatures ought to adore Him.

1. "We know that the Son of God is come, and he hath given us understanding. . . . This is the true God and life eternal." (1 John v, 20.) "Christ . . . who is over all things, God blessed for ever." (Rom. ix, 5.)

2. "In him [Christ] dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporally." (Col. ii, 9.) *St. John,* speaking of the Son of God, says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made." (John i, 1–3.)

3. "In the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father." (Phil. ii, 10, 11.) "Let all the angels of God adore him." (Hebr. i, 6.)

The apostles confirmed their teaching regarding the divinity of Christ by numerous miracles wrought in His name, and especially by the most astounding of all miracles, the conversion of the world. In defence of this doctrine they suffered and died.

"By the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people . . . insomuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that when Peter came, his shadow at the least might overshadow any of them, and they might be delivered from their infirmities." (Acts v, 12, 16.) "God wrought by the hand of Paul more than common miracles, so that even there were brought from his body to the sick handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them." (Acts xix, 11.) Some of the miracles wrought by the apostles are described in detail, for instance the cure of the lame man in the Temple, the cure of the man sick of the palsy (Acts iii, ix), the raising of *Tabitha* by *Peter* (Acts ix), the cure of the lame man at Lystra (Acts xiv) and of the father of *Publius* at Malta (Acts xxviii). We may mention also the gift of tongues, the conversion of *Saul,* and the release of *Peter* from prison by the agency of an angel.

The miracles of the apostles are evidence of Christ's divinity, because being sent by Him, they worked them in His name, in proof of their divine mission.

St. Peter said to the lame man: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk" (Acts iii, 6), and to the Sanhedrin: "By the name of our Lord Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God hath raised from the dead, even by him this man standeth here before you whole." (Acts iv, 10.) *St. Augustine* thus refutes the arguments of those who deny that the apostles worked miracles: "Three things are incredible that yet really took place; firstly it is incredible that Jesus rose from the dead and ascended into heaven; secondly it is incredible that the world ever believed so incredible a thing; thirdly it is incredible that a few obscure and ignorant people could induce the world — including learned men — firmly to believe so incredible a thing. If any one refuses to believe the first of these incredible things, he must nevertheless behold the second with his own eyes, and he cannot account for it, unless he accepts the third. Yet the evidence in support of the first incredible thing consisted

of wonderful actions, not merely of words, for those who had not themselves seen Jesus after He rose again, nor when He ascended into heaven, believed those who said that they had seen Him, and not only said so, but worked miracles in support of their assertion. If any one refuses to believe that the apostles worked miracles to make men trust them, he must be satisfied with the one great miracle that the world, in the absence of miracles, believed in Christ's resurrection and ascension. Therefore either incredible things, i.e., miracles, have induced the world to accept the incredible (Christianity), or Christian truth is so trustworthy as to require no miraculous confirmation. In either case the unbeliever is refuted." (de civit. Dei, XXII, 5, 8.)

The Divinity of Christ and the Teaching of the Catholic Church

The Catholic Church has always taught the divinity of Christ and has made this truth the chief and fundamental doctrine of Christianity. When in the fourth century *Arius* denied the divinity of Christ, the whole Church rose up against him, and the Council of Nicaea (325) drew up a creed emphasizing the doctrine that Jesus Christ is truly God and of one substance with the Father.

"I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages. God of God, Light of Light; true God of true God; begotten not made; consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made. . . ." (Symb. Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum.)

The faith of the Church in the divinity of Christ is expressed most emphatically by the Christian martyrs. In every age thousands have suffered most cruel torments and death itself rather than deny this doctrine.

The history of the Christian martyrs unmistakably shows a supernatural character and is one of the most convincing proofs of the divinity of Christ and of the divine origin of Christianity.

The supernatural character of the testimony of the martyrs is seen:

1. In the heroism with which the martyrs endured every conceivable torture. Their calm and often joyous steadfastness has nothing in common with the dogged resignation of a condemned criminal, or with the obstinate defiance displayed by a fanatic suffering for his opinions.

2. In the great number of Christian martyrs, who belong to every nation, age, rank, and calling, and to both sexes.

3. In the constancy shown whenever Christians are persecuted. So universal a manifestation of courage cannot be regarded as a result of merely natural enthusiasm. The supernatural character of their testimony is confirmed by the confessions of many martyrs, the judgment of Christian and non-Christian eyewitnesses, the undeniable miracles that accompanied many martyrdoms, and, above all, the wonderful effects of persecution. "We grow," says *Tertullian,* "as often as you mow us down; the blood of martyrs is the seed of fresh Christians."

The evidence in support of the divinity of Christ is absolutely convincing to the human intellect. The surest remedy for doubts on the subject is to lead a Christian and moral life. Our Saviour Himself says: "If any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." (John vii, 17.)

The Humanity of Jesus Christ

Jesus Christ is not only true God, but also true man. The third article of the Apostles' Creed teaches us that by the action of the Holy Ghost the Son of God became man and was born of Mary, a most pure Virgin.

Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine. (Symb. apost.)

"The Word [i.e., the Only-Begotten of the Father] was made flesh and dwelt among us." (John i, 14.) The use of the word

"flesh" (= human being) refutes the heresy of the *Docetes*, who imagined that the Son of God had assumed only the semblance of a body.

The mystery of the Incarnation consists in the fact that Jesus Christ is at the same time true God and true man; He is God from all eternity, but He became man in time.

When Christ said: "I and the Father are one," or "Before Abraham was, I am," He was speaking of Himself as God; when He said: "The Father is greater than I," and called Himself "the Son of Man," He was speaking of Himself as Man.

Jesus Christ is only one divine Person. The Second Person of the Godhead assumed the human in addition to the divine nature, uniting them inseparably. Hence the Son of God in His human nature became as truly man as in His divine nature He has been truly God from all eternity. This union is termed hypostatic, being a union in person.

A *person* is a rational, independent being, responsible for its own actions. In Christ there is therefore but *one* Ego, *one* agent, and this is the divine Person. By the *nature* of anything we mean the aggregate of all its attributes which distinguish it from things of another kind, e.g., man from beast.

Holy Scripture teaches the unity of the divine Person.

1. It attributes divine and human characteristics to one and the same Person, viz., Jesus Christ.

2. It ascribes divine attributes to the human nature in Christ, and human attributes to His divine nature.

1. Holy Scripture speaks of Christ as possessing divine power and of having assumed flesh and being called "the Son of Man" and "the second Adam."

2. "No man hath ascended into heaven but he that descended from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven." (John iii, 13.) The Son, by whom God hath spoken to us in these days, is "the

brightness of His glory and the figure of His substance." (Hebr. i, 3.) Also conversely: "If they [the princes of this world] had known the wisdom of God, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory." (1 Cor. ii, 8.) "The author of life you killed, whom God hath raised from the dead." (Acts iii, 15.)

In the one Person of Jesus Christ there are two natures, one divine and one human. In His divine nature He acts as God, in His human nature He acts as man.

We may therefore distinguish Christ's divine actions (e.g., forgiving sins) from His human actions (e.g., suffering pain) and from His actions as God-man, in which both natures co-operate (e.g., walking on the sea).

In the one Person of Jesus Christ there are two distinct wills, one divine and one human, since each nature has its own will. The human will, however, was always in complete subjection to the divine.

"Father . . . not my will, but thine be done." (Luke xxii, 42.)

Christological heresies. 1. *Arius,* a priest in Alexandria, denied the divinity of Christ. His heresy was condemned at the Council of Nicaea (325).

2. *Nestorius,* Bishop of Constantinople, denied the unity of Person in Christ, whom he described as *θεοφόρος*, a bearer of God, believing that the Son of God dwelt in the man Jesus in the same way as God dwells in every just person. According to *Nestorius,* Mary might be called "Mother of Christ" (*χριστοτόκος*), but not "Mother of God" (*θεοτόκος*). In opposition to these doctrines the Council of Ephesus (431) decided that Christ was only One, at once God and Man, and the Council of Chalcedon (451) taught that Christ was not divided into two Persons, but was one Person.

3. *Eutyches,* Archimandrite in Constantinople, denied the twofold nature in Christ. In an argument with *Nestorius* he asserted the unity of our Lord's natures, and hence his followers were known as Monophysites. *Leo I* and the Council of Chalcedon (451) declared that there were two natures in Christ, neither intermixed nor transformed.

4. *Sergius,* Patriarch of Constantinople, denied that Christ

possessed a twofold will and thought that His wills had amalgamated to form one energy. The followers of *Sergius* were called Monothelites. Pope *Honorius,* misled by some ambiguous statements on their part, did not at once condemn the heresy, but it was anathematized by Pope *Agatho* and the First Trullan Council (Sixth Council of Constantinople, 680).

From the unity of Person in two natures it follows:

1. That worship is due to Jesus as man.

2. That His humanity was exalted to the highest perfection and sanctity.

3. That Jesus could never commit a personal fault nor incur any stain of sin.

This explains the sense in which Jesus could be said to advance "in wisdom and age and grace with God and men." (Luke ii, 52.) Interior advancement was not possible, but Jesus advanced, inasmuch as He gave more and more outward expression to the fulness of His wisdom and sanctity as He increased in age.

From the unity of Person in two natures it follows also that Mary may rightly be called Mother of God (θεοτόκος), for by the action of the Holy Ghost she gave birth to the true Son of God, not to a mere man. Rightly, too, do we call Mary "the Virgin," for she remained ever an incomparably pure and spotless virgin, before, in, and after the birth of her divine Child.

"The Holy, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." (Luke i, 35.) "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel [God with us]." (Is. vii, 14.)

Wherever in Holy Scripture there is mention of the brothers and sisters of Christ, only near relatives are understood. Lot is called Abraham's brother, although he was really his nephew.

The purpose of the Incarnation was twofold. The Son of God became man:

1. In order to be able to suffer and die for us, since as God He could neither suffer nor die.

2. In order to teach us virtue and sanctity by His word and example.

By His word and example Jesus taught us every virtue in the highest degree, especially zeal for God's glory and for the salvation of mankind, meekness, humility, patience, kindness, and mercy towards all, even bitter enemies, and obedience even unto death towards His heavenly Father. By His example Jesus taught the young to take delight in prayer and instruction and in visiting God's house; He showed them how to render willing obedience and to advance in wisdom and grace as they grow older.

Jesus might have led a life of luxury and honour, but He chose to be poor and humble, in order:

1. To suffer for our sake from the very beginning of His life.

2. To teach us not to love or desire the empty advantages offered by this world.

The following are the chief outward events of the life of Christ: 1. As had been foretold, our Saviour was born in a stable at Bethlehem (Christmas). Shepherds from the neigbourhood were the first to see and worship Him; subsequently the wise men came from the East; the former were summoned by angels, the latter by a star. 2. On the fortieth day after His birth, in accordance with the Old Testament law, the Child Jesus was carried by His Mother to the Temple and there offered up to God (Candlemas). 3. In order to avoid *Herod's* persecution, *Mary* and *Joseph* fled with the divine Child into Egypt (Holy Innocents). 4. After their return from Egypt until His thirtieth year Jesus dwelt at Nazareth with His parents and was subject to them. 5. When He was thirty years of age, He went to the river Jordan and was baptized by *John;* thence He passed into the desert, where He fasted forty days and nights. 6. He then began to teach publicly and to gather about Him a band of disciples, twelve of whom He selected to be His personal companions and His apostles (messengers). 7. Through the envy of the Jewish authorities He was finally condemned to death by crucifixion, but rose again on the third day, and after the lapse of forty days returned to His Father in heaven.

CHAPTER VII

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

I. THE NATURE, MARKS, AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE CHURCH

Foundation, Mission, and Constitution of the Church

JESUS CHRIST founded on earth á spiritual kingdom or Church. At His entrance upon His public life He collected a band of disciples, chose from among them twelve to be apostles, and for three years instructed these twelve men. He conferred upon them His own authority and sent them forth to preach, baptize, and govern those that accept baptism.

The word "Church" is derived from the Greek and means "house of the Lord." The original designation was ἐκκλησία, ecclesia, assembly.

"All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matth. xxviii, 18–20.)

"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. . . . Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." (John xx, 21, 23.)

After receiving the Holy Ghost at Pentecost the apostles went out into all parts of the world, preaching, baptizing, and gathering together all who believed and were baptized. In this way the first Christian communities were formed, each under the direction of one of the apostles.

In the Acts of the Apostles (ii, 41; iv, 32; viii, 14) there is mention of the churches of Jerusalem and Samaria. Soon afterwards others were founded in Antioch, Philippi, Corinth, Ephesus, Cyprus, Crete, etc.

As the Christian communities of the primitive Church multiplied, the apostles consecrated bishops to preside over them, giving these bishops full authority to consecrate and appoint others (bishops and priests). The various communities were closely connected one with another; they professed the same faith, partook of the same sacraments, and formed collectively a single Christian community having a common head, viz., *St. Peter.*

Constitution of the primitive Church. 1. In order to justify the abolition of the hierarchy and priesthood by the so-called Reformers in the sixteenth century, a new theory was propounded regarding the primitive Church. According to this theory, the apostles were merely preachers, "ministers of the word" (Acts vi, 4), and left to each Christian community the task of organizing itself. This organization was carried out on different lines by the various communities; in some, freely elected ἐπίσκοποι or πρεσβύτεροι preached and conducted liturgical worship, in others specially gifted (charismatic) members of the community exercised the religious functions, instead of, or in addition to, ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι. It was only in the course of the second century that the hierarchical form of Church government was evolved out of the democratic and gradually became universal.

2. If the primitive Church had had a democratic constitution, it would certainly have been opposed to Christ's orders, for He conferred His authority exclusively upon the apostles, not upon the faithful in general. There are clear statements in the Acts of the Apostles and in the epistles showing that the early Church was not democratic in character, but that the apostles spoke and acted as having the right to govern. They made laws and rules; they threatened, judged, and inflicted penalties; they excluded unworthy persons from the Church (1 Cor. v, 5; 1 Tim. i, 20) and readmitted those who were penitent (2 Cor. ii, 10). Moreover the appointment of priests rested, not with the community, but with the apostles. *Paul* and *Barnabas* "ordained . . . priests

in every church." (Acts xiv, 22.) The apostle of the Gentiles writes to *Titus:* "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst ordain priests in every city." (Titus i, 5.)

3. The words ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος were originally interchangeable, although even in the apostolic age the functions of bishops, priests, and deacons were clearly distinguished. Each community of Christians was governed either by a bishop (episcopus), or by a council, the members of which (presbyteri, episcopi) were under a bishop. Just as some of the apostles, notwithstanding their missionary labours, finally became regular bishops (*St. Peter* in Rome, *St. James* in Jerusalem, *St. John* in Ephesus), so did other bishops subsequently govern the churches. The priests formed a sort of council over which the bishop presided, and they generally held some permanent office connected with a church. The deacons superintended public worship, administered baptism and Holy Communion, when commissioned by the bishops to do so, looked after the poor, and administrated the revenues.

In the third century other subordinate officials were appointed, such as doorkeepers, lectors, exorcists, and acolytes. The parochial system, which places each parish in charge of a parish priest, dates from the fourth century.

4. From the very beginning all the Christian communities collectively were subject to the apostolic college, over which *St. Peter* presided. In order to settle divergencies of opinion concerning the admission of Gentiles to the Church, the apostles held a council at Jerusalem (Acts xv), and with *St. Peter* as their president they made rules for the whole Church. This aggregation of communities was known as the Catholic or universal Church, or simply as the Church. The word "Catholic" occurs in the letter (cap. 8) addressed by *St. Ignatius* (died 107 A.D.) to the Christians in Smyrna, as well as in the Acts of *Polycarp*, Bishop of Smyrna, who had been one of the disciples of the apostles.

The mission of the Church is to bring all men to everlasting salvation; she therefore continues the work begun by Jesus Christ, i.e., to preach what He taught, to administer the means of grace, and to guide the faithful on their way to heaven.

That the Church might be able to discharge this

threefold duty Christ gave her the assistance of the Holy Spirit and transferred to her His own threefold office, that of teacher, priest, and shepherd.

1. The teaching office of the Church is exercised when she preaches Christ's doctrines, denounces heresies, and settles disputes on matters of faith.

2. The priestly office of the Church is exercised in offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass and in administering sacraments and sacramentals.

3. The pastoral office of the Church is exercised in governing the faithful, in laying down laws and watching over the manner in which they are observed, and punishing transgressors.

The Church is therefore the community of all Christians on earth who are united in the confession of the same faith and in the participation of the same sacraments, under one supreme head — the Pope — and the bishops, who are his subordinates.

Church and State. 1. The Church of Jesus Christ exists in virtue of her divine institution and exercises her sacred office in virtue of the authority divinely bestowed upon her. Therefore she needs no permission or authorization from any secular power to be established in any country. The apostles worked freely and openly, and when the Jewish priests forbade them to preach, they replied: "We ought to obey God rather than men." (Acts v, 29.)

The secular as well as the spiritual power originates in God. (Rom. xiii, 1–7; 1 Peter ii, 13, etc.) Just as the Church in her sphere of action is independent of the State, so is the State in secular matters independent of the Church. Yet since both State and Church, the temporal and the spiritual authority, were instituted by God for the common advantage of mankind, they ought not to be separated, still less ought they to be antagonistic, but they should support and uphold each other. This is particularly to be desired in matters affecting the interests of both, such as education, marriage, etc.

2. In the Middle Ages great obscurity prevailed regarding the relation between these two authorities, and violent conflicts arose, greatly to the detriment of the papacy and the State no less than the whole of Christendom. At the present time

more light has been thrown upon the subject, and the independence of Church and State from each other is almost universally recognized. On the part of the Church there have been authoritative statements to this effect, especially in the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII. "The Church acknowledges and declares that temporal matters are under the control of the State, which is supreme in its own department." [1]

"Each power is in its own sphere supreme." [2] "Church and State alike possess individual sovereignty, neither obeys the other." [3]

3. The assertion that the Church, being within the State, ought to be subject to the State, cannot be maintained. The Catholic Church exists all over the world and is not limited to any single State. The members of the Church belong, it is true, to various States, and as subjects of each State are bound to obey it in temporal matters, according to our Lord's words: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." (Matth. xxii, 21.) In all that concerns religion and morals, as members of the Catholic Church, they are bound to obey her spiritual authority.

The Primacy of St. Peter and his Successors

The Church is a self-governing society consisting of rulers and ruled. As a society she possesses a constitution, which is hierarchical in form, since Christ did not confer His power immediately upon the faithful, but upon the hierarchy which He established.

1. Hierarchy means literally "sacred government," originated in heaven, not on earth. In a transferred sense the name is applied to the Pope and bishops, who administer this government, and in an extended use it is made to include priests and deacons.

2. Christians not in holy orders are termed the laity, as distinguished from the clergy, clerico; the latter word is derived from Κλῆρος, a lot, inasmuch as God has chosen them, as it were by lot, to hold a higher position, and also because they have chosen God to be in a special sense their lot in life. "God

[1] "Diuturnum," June 29, 1881.
[2] "Immortale Dei," November 1, 1885.
[3] "Sapientiae Christianae," January 10, 1890.

hath set the members every one of them in the body [i.e., the Church], as it hath pleased him," says *St. Paul;* "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors." (1 Cor. xii, 18, 28.) "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." (Eph. iv, 11, 12.)

3. It is true that *St. Peter* speaks (1 Peter ii, 9) of all Christians as "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation," but he does so only figuratively, inasmuch as by means of the sacraments all are consecrated to God and are bound to offer to Him spiritual sacrifices.

Christ Himself is the invisible supreme Head of the Church. From Him all power in the Church is derived, and He will continue to guide and govern her even to the end of the world.

"He [i.e., the Father] hath subjected all things under his feet, and hath made him head over all the Church." (Eph. i, 22.) "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. iv, 1.) "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matth. xxviii, 20.)

The Church, being a visible society, must have also a visible head. Christ appointed *St. Peter* to be this visible head, by giving him precedence over the other apostles; this precedence is what we call the Primacy.

Christ conferred His threefold office upon *all* the apostles, who were to form a corporate body and exercise their functions under *St. Peter's* guidance.

Christ really conferred the Primacy upon *St. Peter,* which appears from our Lord's words:

1. He founded His Church upon the rock of *Peter.*
2. He gave Him the keys of the kingdom of heaven.
3. He commissioned him alone to feed His whole flock.

1. "Thou art Peter [Aram. Cephas = rock], and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matth. xvi, 18.) Because *St. Peter* was to be the foundation of the Church, Christ prayed for him that his faith might not fail, and bade him confirm his brethren. (Luke xxii, 32.)

2. "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." (Matth. xvi, 19.)

3. "Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep." (John xxi, 15, 17.)

Early in His public life Jesus distinguished *St. Peter* in various ways, showing that he was to occupy a particular position; He gave him a very significant name, foretold that he should catch men instead of fishes, washed his feet before those of the other disciples, appeared to him after His resurrection, and predicted the kind of martyrdom that he would undergo.

It is true that *St. Paul* speaks of the apostles collectively as the foundation of the Church (Eph. ii, 20); they formed a corporate body of which *St. Peter* was the foundation, since he was the rock upon which the whole Church, including the apostles, was built. He received full and independent authority; that of the other apostles was only subordinate.

That *Peter* possessed the Primacy appears from two facts:

1. That immediately after Christ's ascension he actually discharged the functions of the supreme head of the Church.

2. That he was always recognized by the Church as being the chief of the apostles and as shepherd of Christ's whole flock.

1. Whenever anything important had to be done or decided, *Peter* spoke first and assumed authority over the others. He did so, for instance, at the election of *Matthias*, at Pentecost, at the dispute regarding the admission of the Gentiles to the Church, at the assembly of the apostles at Jerusalem, etc. (Acts i, ii, xi, xv.)

In enumerating the apostles the evangelists invariably mention *Peter* first, although he was not the eldest, nor was he the first called by our Lord. *St. Matthew* says emphatically (x, 2):

"The names of the twelve apostles are these: the first *Simon*, who is called *Peter*," etc.

2. At the general Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.) the Fathers of the Church declared it to be "a fact, disputed by none, but accepted in every age, that *St. Peter* was the prince and chief of the apostles and the foundation of the Catholic Church."

The Primacy in the Church could not cease at *St. Peter's* death, for (1) the Church was to continue as established by Christ; therefore the Rock on which she was founded also continued to exist, and the office of chief Shepherd, instituted for her government, could not fall into abeyance. (2) A visible head was necessary even when the Church was still in her infancy and few or no heresies had arisen, but it was still more essential as she developed and heresies and schisms multiplied.

St. Peter's Primacy passed on from him to his successors occupying the episcopal see of Rome; hence the legitimate Bishop of Rome has always been recognized as the visible head of the Church and the Vicar of Christ.

1. *St. Peter* founded the bishopric of Rome and occupied it himself until his death, for which reason the primacy of *St. Peter* is inseparably connected with the Roman see. Every legitimate successor of *St. Peter* as Bishop of Rome is also his legitimate successor as head of the Church. Some antagonists of the papacy have questioned the fact of *St. Peter's* residence in Rome, but it has been proved in a convincing manner by historical research. No one ever doubted that *St. Peter* was buried in Rome. As early an authority as *St. Ignatius* (ob. 107) writes to the Romans: "I cannot command you like *Peter* and *Paul*," and *St. Cyprian* (ob. 258) calls the Roman Church "the see of *Peter*."

2. The name "pope" is derived from πάπας, father, a title given originally also to other bishops. We call the Pope the "Holy Father" on account of the sanctity of the office that he holds, being the head and father of all the faithful. He speaks of himself as episcopus, or servus servorum Dei. His official

writings are called *bulls* (bullae), from the seal attached to them, or *briefs* (brevia); the former deal with grave, the latter with less important matters. *Encyclicals* are letters addressed to the bishops of the whole world. In his capacity as supreme bishop the Pope wears the *tiara,* a triple crown, symbolizing his threefold office, and as *St. Peter's* successor he has on his finger the Fisherman's ring. Originally the Pope was elected by the bishops of the neighbouring sees, the clergy, and the people of Rome, but since 1059 the election has been in the hands of the cardinals, who meet for this purpose in an enclosed space (conclave).

3. In the course of time, by God's disposition, the successors of *St. Peter* acquired a temporal dominion, known as the States of the Church. These lands were acquired in a perfectly legitimate manner, mostly by gift and bequest, but the Vicar of Christ was deprived of them in 1870. It is desirable that the head of the Church should have some temporal possessions, to secure his independence, for only thus is it possible for him to exercise freely the supreme power, bestowed on him by our Lord Himself, of governing the Church throughout the world, and to enforce without let or hindrance the laws necessary for her welfare.

√ The Primacy of the Roman Pope has been acknowledged in word and deed by all the Fathers and councils of the Church in every period of her history.

√ 1. *The Fathers of the Church. St. Ignatius* (ob. 107) called the Roman Church the Mistress of the covenant of charity.

√ *St. Irenaeus* (ob. 202) says: "Every church [i.e., the faithful in every place] must needs agree with this [Roman] church on account of her peculiar prerogative." (adv. haer., III, 3, 2.)

√ *St. Cyprian* (ob. 258) asks: "How can he who cuts himself off from the see of *Peter,* on whom the Church is founded, imagine that he belongs to the Church." (de unit. eccl., n. 4.)

√ 2. *Councils.* The Council of *Ephesus* (431) declared that "*Peter,* the Prince of the apostles, the pillar of the faith, and the foundation of the Catholic Church, continues to live and judge in his successors." (Conc. Ephes. Act., III.) At the Sixth Council of *Constantinople* (680) a document by Pope *Agatho* was read aloud, and the assembled Fathers exclaimed: "*Peter* hath spoken by the mouth of *Agatho;*" they also called the Roman bishopric "the foremost see in the Church." The Council of *Florence* (1438) appealed to the proceedings of the general councils and to the statutes of the Church when declar-

ing that "the bishop of Rome enjoys preëminence over the whole world; he is the successor of *Peter,* prince of the apostles, the true Vicar of Christ, the Head of the entire Church, the father and teacher of all Christians, and to him, in the person of *St. Peter,* was supreme power given by our Lord Jesus Christ, that he might feed, guide, and govern the whole Church." This statement, made at the Council of Florence, was renewed at the *Vatican* Council. (Sess. 4, c. 3.)

3. Facts prove that the papal primacy was universally acknowledged. No general council has ever been held at which the Pope or his representative did not preside, and no decision or definition of universal validity has ever been issued that was not previously confirmed by the Pope. In every period all who refused to recognize the Pope as head of the Church have been regarded by the faithful as renegades and apostates.

The Primacy consists in the supreme power, possessed by the Roman pontiff, to teach and govern the whole Church.

1. All the bishops, the clergy, and the laity are directly subject to the ordinary power of the Pope and owe him obedience in matters of faith and morals as well as on points of ecclesiastical discipline and Church government. From this point of view the Church of Christ is plainly seen to be one fold under one supreme shepherd.

2. It would be a mistake to suppose (1) that the Pope has only a precedence of honour over the other bishops, or (2) that he derives his supremacy from the bishops and the laity and not from Christ Himself, or (3) that the validity of his pronouncements and regulations depends upon the assent of the bishops and the laity. Such opinions were promulgated in France by the adherents of Gallicanism and in Germany by those of Febronianism.

The Episcopate

Like the Primacy of *St. Peter,* the threefold office, common to all the apostles, was intended to be permanent and, passing on from the apostles to their successors, to continue without interruption to the end of the world. Sending forth the apostles, our Lord

promised to be with them always, even to the consummation of the world, which shows plainly that the promise did not apply to the apostles alone, but also to their successors. Their successors are the duly consecrated bishops in communion with the supreme head of the Church, i.e., the bishops of the Catholic Church.

No one separated from the head of the Church can be a successor of the apostles, since, by being separated from the head, he is incapable of being a member of the Church. Hence *St. Ambrose* laid it down as a general principle: *Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia.* (Ps. 40, n. 30.)

The chief differences between apostles and bishops are (1) that the apostles were commissioned directly by Christ, (2) that they had to regard the entire world as their sphere of activity, and (3) that each of them individually was infallible.

The task assigned to the bishops by divine dispensation is to govern the Church in communion with and under obedience to the Pope, their supreme head. This follows from the words in which Christ conferred their threefold office upon the apostles and *Peter.* Hence *St. Paul* said to the elders of the Church at Ephesus: "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God." (Acts xx, 28.)

The Pope's supremacy does not in any way diminish the ordinary and direct authority which the bishops in their pastoral capacity exercise over the faithful in their respective dioceses. On the contrary, their power derives support, protection, and strength from the chief shepherd of all the faithful. *St. Gregory* the Great says on this subject: "My honour is the honour of the whole Church. My honour is the firm support of my brethren. I am truly honoured when the honour that beseems him is not withheld from any individual." (ep. ad Eulog., l. 8, ep. 30.)

The division of the episcopate into bishops, archbishops (metropolitans), primates, and patriarchs is a matter of ecclesiastical regulation.

Bishops take part in governing the Church (1) when they separately govern the diocese assigned to them by the Pope, and (2) when they assemble from time to time in order to discuss matters affecting the welfare of the whole Church and jointly to issue decisions and regulations.

Because the bishop possesses an ordinary jurisdiction in his diocese, he is called the *ordinary*. Assemblies of bishops for joint deliberation are called councils or synods. Councils are provincial, national, or oecumenical, according as they consist of the bishops of a province, a nation, or the entire world. The decisions of every council require confirmation by the Pope. Oecumenical councils affect the whole Church and can be convoked only by the Pope, who acts as president, either personally or through a legate as his representative. These councils are by far the most important. Hitherto twenty general councils have been held, namely:

1. The First Council of Nicaea, 325 (Arius).
2. The First Council of Constantinople, 381 (Macedonius and Apollinaris).
3. The Council of Ephesus, 431 (Nestorius).
4. The Council of Chalcedon, 451 (Eutyches).
5. The Second Council of Constantinople, 553 (The Three Chapters).
6. The Third Council of Constantinople, 680 (Monothelites).
7. The Second Council of Nicaea, 787 (Iconoclasts).
8. The Fourth Council of Constantinople, 869 (Photius).
9. The First Lateran Council, 1123 (Investitures).
10. The Second Lateran Council, 1139 (Church discipline).
11. The Third Lateran Council, 1179 (Albigenses).
12. The Fourth Lateran Council, 1215 (Reformation of morals, Crusade, Easter Communion).
13. The First Council of Lyons, 1245 (Frederick II).
14. The Second Council of Lyons, 1274 (Crusade, Greek schism).
15. The Council of Vienne, 1311 (Knights Templars).
16. The Council of Constance, 1414–1418 (Schismatics).
17. The Council of Florence, 1439 (Reunion with the Greek Church).
18. The Fifth Lateran Council, 1511–1517 (Church reforms).
19. The Council of Trent, 1545–1563 (Reform of abuses, definition of Catholic doctrines).

20. The Vatican Council, 1869–1870 (Modern errors, papal infallibility and jurisdiction).

A bishop cannot personally satisfy all the spiritual needs of the people in his diocese, and so he requires assistants. These are the priests appointed to have the care of souls, and through these priests the bishop exercises his functions in each of the parishes belonging to his diocese.

A priest can be in charge of a parish only if appointed and authorized by his bishop.

A priest is ordained and appointed, not by his people, but by God Himself, through his lawful superior. All priests thus ordained and appointed are "ambassadors for Christ, God as it were exhorting by them" (2 Cor. v, 20), and instruments used by God for the salvation of men. To all of them apply the words addressed by Christ to His apostles: "He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." (Luke x, 16.)

Unity and good discipline are maintained throughout the Church by obedience, inasmuch as those who are not priests obey the priests, priests obey the bishops, and bishops the pope. *St. Clement, St. Peter's* disciple and successor, compares the Church with an army, in which the rank and file obey their captains, the captains their colonels, and the colonels their commander in chief.

The Church as a Visible Society

When we speak of the Church as visible, we mean that her members form a corporate body and outwardly profess their adherence to her. The Church of Christ can therefore be recognized by her external manifestations and distinguished from every other religious body.

The Church of Christ must be visible, for otherwise our Lord could not have threatened us with everlasting damnation unless we belong to and obey the Church. "If thy brother offend against thee . . . and if he will not hear thee, tell the

church; and if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Matth. xviii, 17.)

The Church of Christ is a true, corporate society, since, according to the constitution that He gave her, she contains subjects and rulers, the latter in turn being subordinated to a common and supreme head.

For this reason Christ compared His Church to a kingdom (Matth. xvi, 19), a city (Matth. v, 14; Apoc. xxi, 2), a sheepfold (John xxi, 15), and a tribunal (Matth. xviii, 17), whilst *St. Paul* called her the house of God (1 Tim. iii, 15; cf. 1 Peter ii, 5) and the body of Christ (1 Cor. xii, 27).

The Church reveals herself as a true, corporate society:

1. In her rulers and her organization.
2. In the proposition and profession of her doctrine.
3. In the offering of the Mass and the administration of her sacraments.

The Church is (1) not, as *Calvin* thought, the whole body of the elect; (2) not, as *Luther* taught, all men collectively who profess Christianity, (3) nor a union of several distinct religious organizations. The Church is *one* corporate body of people, professing the true faith of Christ and subject to her teaching and governing authority.

Since the Church is a true, corporate society, she possesses an activity or life of her own. This may be viewed from two aspects:

1. The Church as a corporate society has an exterior life, manifesting itself outwardly.
2. She has the supernatural life of faith, grace, and virtue, working inwardly in her members.

The former is known as the body, the latter as the soul of the Church.

Every baptized person who has neither voluntarily cut himself off from the Church nor been expelled from her is a member of the Church.

By Holy Baptism we are incorporated into the community of believers in Christ, and sanctifying grace, as well as the divine virtues of faith, hope, and charity, are infused into our souls so that thenceforth we belong to both the body and soul of the Church.

If a baptized person commits grievous sin, he continues to be a member of the body of the Church, but he belongs to her soul only in an imperfect way, viz., by faith alone.

If a baptized person loses his faith and yet does not cut himself off from the body of the Church, he is like a withered branch on a tree, a dead and useless member, bringing down upon himself everlasting condemnation.

Membership of the Church is lost by voluntary separation from her. We are bound, but not compelled, to belong to the Church, and it is in our power to sever the bond formed at baptism and to quit her fold.

Two classes of people are voluntarily separated from the Church: (1) those who by their own fault are heretics, i.e., profess some doctrine condemned by the Church, or who are infidels and have renounced Christianity; (2) those who by their own fault are schismatics, i.e., who refuse to obey the ecclesiastical superiors, although they accept the doctrines of the Church. People who are heretics or schismatics by their own fault are called formal heretics or formal schismatics.

Membership of the Church is lost by expulsion from her communion. Excommunicated persons are under the ban of the Church, having been expelled as unworthy members.

1. Excommunication is an act of ecclesiastical authority by means of which a baptized person, as a punishment for flagrant offences against the Church, is expelled from her communion and excluded from participation in her benefits.

The right of the Church to exclude obstinate members from her community springs from the fact that she is a perfect society. Her rulers must have authority to expel injurious members, and that they possess this authority is plain from Christ's words: "If a man will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Matth. xviii, 17.) Because of some flagrant moral offence, *St. Paul* excluded a Corinthian from

communion with the Church. (1 Cor. v, 13.) If they comply with the necessary conditions, excommunicated persons may at any time be reconciled and readmitted to the Church.

2. Offences entailing excommunication without judicial decision are apostasy, heresy, schism, usurpation of ecclesiastical authority and obstructing its exercise, seizure of the property and oppression of the Roman Church, duelling, and becoming a Freemason. Excommunication may be pronounced by judicial sentence, on account of flagrant moral or other offences, which the rulers of the Church feel bound to punish with this severest penalty.

The consequences of excommunication are exclusion from the sacraments, from assistance at Holy Mass, and from participation in public processions, and also loss of all right to Christian burial.

A man who, through no fault of his own, is a heretic or schismatic, but honestly seeks the truth and to the best of his knowledge does the will of God, is spiritually united with the Church and participates in her benefits, although he is not a member of her body.

A person who, by no fault of his own, is cut off from the body of the Church is regarded by her not as a miscreant, but as mistaken, and his errors, being not culpable, are not imputed to him as sins. It is possible for him to belong perfectly to the soul of the Church if he has never lost the grace of baptism by grievous sin or if, having lost it, he has recovered the grace of justification by perfect contrition. Those who live as heretics or schismatics by no fault of their own are called material heretics or material schismatics.

The Characteristic Marks of the Church

The true Church of Christ must be *one,* for Christ founded but one Church, just as He taught but one faith, instituted but one baptism, and established but one fold for all the nations upon earth.

Christ said: "Upon this rock I will build my Church" (not churches). (Matth. xvi, 18.) "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." (Eph. iv, 5.) "There shall be one fold and one shep-

herd." (John x, 16.) *St. Paul* spoke of the Church as "the body of Christ" (1 Cor. xii, 25); now Christ has only one body, hence there cannot be more than one Church.

Christ founded His Church upon *Peter*, making him the chief shepherd; therefore of all the religious bodies that alone is the true Church of Christ which recognizes *St. Peter* and his lawful successors as chief shepherds.

It was upon the rock of *Peter* that Christ founded His Church, and *Peter* alone was commissioned to feed His lambs and sheep. The historical evidence of the gospels enables us to recognize the Incarnate Son of God as the true Redeemer of mankind, and in the same way history bears unmistakable testimony to the Church that He founded on *Peter*. The Church of *Peter* is the Church of Christ. "*Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia.*" (*Ambrose*, cf. 159.) No society of Chrisctians can be the Church of Christ unles its origin can be traced back to *St. Peter* and unless it is subject to his successors.

The Church of Christ possesses four plain marks by which she can easily be recognized as the true Church. She is (1) one, (2) holy, (3) catholic, and (4) apostolic.

Christ founded a visible Church (cf. 161) and desires all men to be able to recognize her, since all should belong to her. Hence the Church must have certain marks or notes by which she may be known. The four distinguishing marks are mentioned in the Nicene Creed: *Credo in unam, sanctam, catholicam, et apostolicam ecclesiam.*

These four marks correspond to the nature of the Church and are therefore necessary. The Church of Christ must be:

1. *One*, because Christ taught only *one* faith.
2. *Holy*, because it is her task to sanctify mankind.
3. *Catholic*, because she is intended for all nations.
4. *Apostolic*, because her rulers must be successors of the apostles.

Of all Christian societies, one alone is founded on *St. Peter* and possesses the marks that the true Church of Christ must possess. This is the Roman Catholic Church, i.e., the Church that recognizes the Pope at Rome as her supreme head.

The Roman Catholic Church is unmistakably *one,* since she everywhere and at all times possesses:

1. The same faith.
2. The same sacrifice and sacraments.
3. A supreme head ruling her whole organization.

The one doctrine taught by the Church is defined unalterably in her official professions of faith, decisions of councils, ritual, liturgy, and catechisms (*Catechismus Romanus* and the various diocesan catechisms). Books of instruction on matters of faith are examined by the bishops and published with their approval. In every age opinions opposed to the teaching of the Church have been condemned by those in authority.

"The faith received from the apostles is preserved by the Church with as great care as if she occupied but one house, whereas she has spread over the whole world, and she accepts this faith as if she had but one heart and soul, and she proclaims and teaches it as if she had but one mouth. For although there are different languages, the substance of our tradition is always the same. The churches established in Germany do not believe or teach anything different from the churches in Iberia, or Gaul, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Lybia, or in the centre of the world. But just as there is one and the same sun all over the world, so does the preaching of truth shed light everywhere, enlightening all who desire to come to a knowledge of the truth." (*Irenaeus* (ob. 202), adv. haer., I, 10, 2.)

The Roman Catholic Church is *holy:*

1. Because her Founder and her doctrines are holy.
2. Because she preserves and administers all the means of sanctification instituted by Christ.
3. Because she shows herself actually realizing Christ's aim, and because the Holy Ghost really resides in her. There have always been saints in the Catholic

Church, whose sanctity has been confirmed by miracles and extraordinary graces bestowed upon them by God.

The shortcomings of individuals cannot be imputed to the Church, since they occur not in consequence of her teaching and institutions, but in spite of them, through human frailty and passion.

Even in the apostolic age there were scandals and bad men in the Church (1 Cor. v, 11; Apoc. ii, 2), and Christ Himself tolerated an unworthy apostle. He indicated the scandals that would arise in the future when He compared the Church to a field on which wheat and cockle grow together, and to a net containing both good and bad fish. (Matth. xiii.)

The Roman Catholic Church is *Catholic* or *universal:*

1. Because from the time of Christ she has always existed through the course of ages.

2. Because she has spread to every part of the world.

3. Because she still continues to grow, in accordance with the divine commission: "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature." (Mark xvi, 15.)

1. In obedience to this command Catholic missionaries penetrate to the most remote countries and with very inadequate support bring the tidings of salvation to all men. The results of Catholic missionary enterprise far surpass those of every other religious body, although many heretics do their utmost to win adherents by founding schools, circulating Bibles, and lavishing money. The heroism of many of our missionaries is marvellous; it is often crowned with martyrdom, and, when a persecution breaks out, their converts display equal fortitude.

2. The Church of which the Pope is the head has always been called Catholic, even by apostates and infidels, and she is known by this name throughout the world. In speaking of the enemies of the Church *St. Augustine* says: "Whether they like it or not, if they wish to be understood, they cannot call our Church anything but Catholic, since this is the name given her by the entire world." (de vera relig., 7, 12.)

3. The number of Catholics is about 270 millions, that of Oriental Christians not in communion with Rome 110 millions

(divided into at least eight distinct "churches"). There are 170 million Protestants, split up into about 150 sects.

Assuming that there are 1600 million inhabitants of the world, 550 millions (34 per cent) are Christians, 220 millions (13.7 per cent) Mahometans, 230 millions (14.4 per cent) Brahmins, 120 millions (7.2 per cent) Buddhists, 250 millions (15.8 per cent) followers of Confucius, 130 millions (8.1 per cent) heathen, and 10 millions (0.6 per cent) Jews.

The Roman Catholic Church is *apostolic:*

1. Because her origin can be traced back with certainty to the apostles.

2. Because her teaching is based upon the apostolic tradition.

3. Because her rulers, the Pope and bishops, are the lawful successors of the apostles.

Many Protestants, especially the Ritualists in England, hold doctrines approximately very close to those of the Catholic Church, and the more they study the writings of the Fathers with a view to discovering the apostolic traditions, the nearer do they draw to the Church.

Except the Roman Catholic Church, no body of Christians possesses the four marks distinguishing the true Church of Christ.

Non-Catholic religious bodies cannot be *one:*

1. Because they have no common supreme head.

2. Because they grant to their members the right to interpret Holy Scripture according to the private judgment of each individual, so that every one is free to believe what he chooses.

"I could not possibly regard any of the Protestant sects and bodies as a divine institution, for what a chaos of systems and creeds presented itself to me! I felt as Nehemias must have done, when he entered Jerusalem after its destruction, and could not find his way through the confused heaps of ruins. Countess *Hahn-Hahn* calls Protestantism a Babylon, . . . no more fitting designation could be discovered. All that we see and hear is

confusion worthy of Babylon! If you bid me justify this reproach, I need only refer you to the list of the lectures that I heard at the university — four folio sheets inscribed with the names of many celebrities. Do you suppose that of all these learned men any two have the same system of theology? Vain hope! What one proves with convincing evidence to-day to be a dogma of faith, another declares to-morrow to be an incomprehensible error, and his arguments are equally good and persuasive. Is it possible to believe a church so full of subjectivity, uncertainty, and contradiction to be the work of Jesus Christ? I cannot describe to you the pain that a consideration of the state of affairs existing among students has always caused me. They have no fixed and unchanging foundation for their faith. Just as each professor has his own opinion, so each student adopts a little standpoint of his own, and one cannot go anywhere without being asked: 'To what school of thought do you belong?' This question always seemed to stab me through the heart; everywhere one encounters subjective opinions, but nowhere any firm ground or any divine authority." (*Emil Usteri*, Protestant minister in Switzerland and afterwards missionary in the East Indies.) "And, on the other side, I found that those who rejected the Petrine claims were notoriously disunited on points of doctrine. . . . For the whole system under which they live is one wild and whirling confusion." (*R. H. Benson.*) Similar testimonies are to be found in Miss *G. Pell Curtis's* interesting volume, "Beyond the Road to Rome."

The non-Catholic religious denominations cannot call themselves *holy:*

1. Because their founders were not holy.

2. Because they reject many dogmas and means of sanctification and set up in their stead principles opposed to holiness of life.

3. Because they cannot boast of any saints whose holiness is ratified by miracles.

"I have often visited both Catholic and non-Catholic libraries and . . . found in the former books that are not in the latter. I noticed works under the heading 'Lives of the Saints,' and saw an immense number of books of this class, containing accounts of various saints of every kind, virgins, widows, hermits, priests, monks, martyrs, missionaries, kings, and other

holy confessors. In these books I read with astonishment the records of their virtue and heroic qualities, the innocence and sanctity of their lives, their ardent devotion, charity, and Christian perfection. I came to the conclusion in my own mind that the religion producing so many saints adorned with great virtue must necessarily be the true faith, for 'a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit.' (Matth. vii, 18.) Now all these saints lived and died in the Roman Catholic faith; hence I argued that this must be the true faith." (*A. Ulrich.*)

The non-Catholic denominations cannot call themselves *universal:*

1. Because they originated in comparatively recent times.

2. Because they have not spread all over the world.

3. Because they continually split up into fresh sects.

"You are upstarts, late comers, dating only from yesterday." These words were addressed by *Tertullian* to the heretics of his day (adv. Prax., 2), and *St. Jerome* asks in a similar fashion: "Why do you appear after the lapse of four hundred years, as if we had hitherto known nothing? Without your teaching the world has been Christian down to the present time. We must remain in the Church founded by the apostles, which has continued in existence to the present day."

The non-Catholic denominations cannot call themselves *apostolic:*

1. Because they did not come into existence until long after the apostolic age and cut themselves off from the Church of the apostles.

2. Because their doctrines differ from those of the apostles.

3. Because their rulers are not lawful successors of the apostles.

"They [the heretics] ought to account for the origin of their churches and display to us the sequence of their bishops, showing that they have regularly succeeded one another and that the

immediate predecessor of the first bishop was an apostle, or one of the apostles' disciples, since it is thus that the apostolic churches trace their descent. For instance, in the Church of Smyrna *Polycarp* was appointed by *John,* and in the Church of Rome *Clement* was ordained by *Peter,* and in the same way all the other churches enumerate their bishops, whom the apostles instituted to propagate the seed that they had sown." (*Tertullian,* de praescr, c. 32.)

"Some people have asserted that in course of time the Church fell into corruption and perversion, so that it became necessary for God to raise up men to restore her original purity. If we asked when the Church departed from the right path, we did not receive a clear and definite answer, but were told that in the first four or five centuries she flourished in spotless purity. . . . I proceeded to examine the history of these four or five hundred years of primitive Christianity and discovered that in this period of perfect purity and beauty the Church had been governed uninterruptedly by popes, bishops, doctors, priests, and deacons, who had all been ordained for their office. I did not perceive this in my own religion, nor did we possess many customs of the Catholic Church that her members conscientiously and carefully observed even in the first four centuries. What struck me still more forcibly, however, was the fact that in early times any religious body that could not trace its succession of bishops back to the time of the apostles was universally regarded as a spurious and schismatical church, and that those who promulgated and obstinately maintained a new doctrine were looked upon and rejected as heretics. This consideration impelled me seriously to investigate the reasons that might have led the early reformers (*Luther, Calvin,* etc.) to cut themselves off from the Catholic Church, and I came to the conclusion that no attention ought to have been paid to these men." (*M. de Flamare.*) "Whatever be historical Christianity, it is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this." (*Newman,* Essay on Development.)

As no Church except the Roman Catholic possesses the distinguishing marks of the true Church of Christ, it follows that the Roman Catholic Church alone is the true Church founded by Christ.

The Attributes of the Church

Christ founded the Church in order that in her and through her men might attain to everlasting salvation; and for the same reason He equipped her with certain properties necessary for the fulfilment of her aim.

1. She is *imperishable,* for she will endure without any essential change to the end of the world.

2. She is *infallible,* for she cannot err in her dogmatic and moral teaching.

3. She is *necessary,* for she is the sole institution for the attainment of eternal happiness.

The Church of Christ is *imperishable,* for:

1. She will last until the end of the world, since Christ founded her for all time and promised to bestow upon her His perpetual help.

2. She will never change, because she would not be the Church of Christ if either her constitution or her attributes were liable to alteration.

"The gates of hell shall not prevail against her." (Matth. xvi, 18.) "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matth. xxviii, 20.) "Go over the list of bishops from *Peter* onwards and consider their succession. The gates of hell cannot prevail against the see of *Peter.*" (*Augustine,* Ps. c. part. Donati.) "There can be no stronger proof of the vitality of this institution [i.e., the Catholic Church] than the fact that she has twice [once in the sixteenth century against Protestantism, and again in the eighteenth century against humanism] succeeded in transforming the flames, that threatened to consume her, into purifying fires, whence she emerged like a phoenix. In the terrible struggles that attended the counter-reformation the Church defended at least part of her dominions against the inroads of the new doctrines, and, if we look closely, we shall see that she has been no less successful in the intellectual and political conflicts of the nineteenth century, even when she has apparently been on the losing side." (*Fr. Jodl.*) "Whilst Rome has thus preserved her wonderful continuity, Europe has thrice changed its form. Ancient his-

tory came to an end, and the Middle Ages passed away. Three great empires, those of *Charlemagne, Charles V,* and *Napoleon,* came into being and died out. Nations that no longer exist once flourished. A new continent was discovered and divided between the powers of Church and State, but only the former has retained her authority. Everything lasts for a time only, ideas, nations, and empires, but Rome alone stands firm, the Pope alone outlives all other rulers. I cannot sufficiently emphasize the fact that we have here something that indeed deserves consideration." (*Nicolas,* Philos. Studies.)

The Infallibility of the Church

When we speak of the Church as *infallible,* we mean:

1. That she never errs in propounding, defining, and explaining revealed truth.

2. That she cannot err, because God Himself guards her from error and thus preserves her in the truth.

The Church is infallible when she teaches revealed truths. We know this with certainty:

1. Because Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against her. (Matth. xvi, 18.)

2. Because *St. Paul* speaks of her as "the pillar and ground of the truth." (1 Tim. iii, 15.)

If the Church could err, she would be overcome by the spirit of falsehood, i.e., hell, and Christ's promise would be null and void.

St. Paul's words show (1) that the Church herself stands firm in the truth, and consequently cannot err, and (2) that she makes us firm in the truth; our faith cannot, therefore, waver if we adhere to the Church.

Christ did not commission all the faithful to proclaim the tidings of salvation, but appointed the apostles to discharge the special function of teaching. Consequently He did not bestow the gift of infallibility upon all the faithful, but upon the apostles and their

successors who were intrusted with the task of teaching.

"Go ye and teach all nations," etc. (Matth. xxviii, 18–20.)

The infallibility of the teaching office in the Church is mentioned plainly in Holy Scripture, for, in appointing the apostles to exercise this office, Christ promised (1) that He would be with them to the end of the world, (2) and that the Spirit of truth should remain with them for ever.

"I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth." (John xiv, 16.)

Tradition bears witness to the fact that men have always believed the teaching office of the Church to be infallible and have regarded as the true doctrine of Christ that to which the bishops, the successors of the apostles, unanimously adhered. As *St. Cyril* says (*Cyrill. Alex.,* ep. ad monach.), the inspiration of the Holy Ghost prevents the bishops, when they are of one accord, from deviating from the truth.

1. In condemning as heretical the teaching of *Paul of Samosata,* the Synod of Antioch (269) stated the Catholic belief and concluded with the words: "This is the faith of the Catholic Church throughout the entire world, and all the bishops are in agreement with us."

2. The teaching office of the Church is sometimes called "the teaching Church," or simply "the Church" (Matth. xviii, 17), and the faithful constitute "the hearing Church." As the latter is bound to submit to the instruction of the former, it follows that the faithful cannot lapse into error as long as they adhere to the Church; the promises of Christ do not, however, apply directly to all the laity, but to the teaching body in the Church. The faithful are bound to submit in matters of faith to the decision of the regularly appointed teachers in the Church. "He [i.e., Christ] gave some . . . pastors and

doctors . . . that henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. iv, 11, 14.)

The infallible teaching body of the Church consists of the Pope, the successor of *St. Peter,* and the bishops in communion with him. As Christ addressed His promises to all the apostles, they apply equally to all their lawful successors, and as He addressed them to the apostles with *Peter,* they apply to the successors of the apostles in union with the Pope.

1. All the apostles possessed the gift of infallibility. In the case of *Peter* this was an ordinary or official gift, but in that of the other apostles it was extraordinary or personal and expired with them. Therefore each individual bishop is not infallible, but the bishops collectively taken and constituting with the Pope the teaching body of the Church enjoy infallibility.

2. Non-Catholics maintain that in course of time the whole teaching authority of the Catholic Church has departed from the truth and lapsed into error. This assertion, however, is manifestly opposed to our divine Saviour's promises. If the nations had been misled by the Catholic Church, the blame would rest with God, who has visibly protected the Church and surrounded her with miracles.

The Church in her teaching capacity is infallible, solely because she enjoys the constant assistance of the Holy Ghost, who preserves her from all error in matters of faith and morals.

"But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." (John xiv, 26.) Sanctity and learning in the teachers of the Church may form a natural guarantee of the truth of their doctrine and so be the basis of a natural faith. But they do not preclude all possibility of error and therefore cannot give rise to the supernatural faith with which we must accept all revealed truths as true. Only God's absolute sincerity can be the motive for such faith.

The Church in her teaching capacity is infallible:

1. When she deals with matters of faith and morals which God has revealed for the salvation of mankind.

2. When she deals with truths and facts not divinely revealed, but necessarily connected with revelation, either as premises or deductions.

Christ endowed His Church with infallibility in order that through her men might receive the whole deposit of faith (2 Tim. i, 14) pure and incorrupt. Hence doctrines of faith and morals are chiefly affected by the infallibility of the Church. In particular infallibility extends (1) to decisions regarding faith and morals, to the interpretation of Holy Scripture, and to the defining of divine tradition. (2) Further, it extends also to philosophical doctrines intimately connected with revelation, such as the distinction between the human and the animal soul; and to historical facts connected with the exercise of the teaching office, such as the legality of a council or of a papal election, the sanctity of an individual, and the objective meaning of some statement bearing on faith.

In deciding debated points in matters of faith the Church is guided by Holy Scripture and tradition; she interprets the word of God intrusted to her in Scripture and by tradition and condemns errors and innovations.

1. No new revelations are vouchsafed to the Church to enable her to decide questions regarding faith; the Holy Ghost guides her so that she rightly interprets already revealed doctrines. When she defines a truth, it is not a new doctrine, but as old as Holy Scripture and tradition; the only novelty is the decision of the Church that this doctrine forms part of revelation. The Church always adheres to the teaching inherited from the Fathers and, like *St. Paul,* bids all men keep the good thing committed to their trust and avoid profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called. (2 Tim. i, 14; 1 Tim. vi, 20.) "Evil men and seducers shall grow worse and worse, erring and driving into error; but continue thou in those things which thou hast learned, and which have been committed to thee." (2 Tim. iii, 13, 14.) "If any one preach to you a gos-

pel besides that which you have received, let him be anathema." (Gal. i, 9.)

2. *Vincent of Lérins* (ob. 450) laid down the rule: "What has been believed everywhere, in every age, and by all men is really and truly Catholic." (*Vinc. Lir.,* commonit., c. II.) This rule must not be reversed so as to limit the idea of Catholic to what has always universally been believed, for it is possible that a doctrine contained in revelation has not been explicitly believed everywhere or in every age, because the Church had not yet proposed it for belief, as either its apostolic origin had not been decided or no one had contested and denied it.

Infallibility in exercising the teaching office in the Church is possessed (1) by the Pope and the bishops in union with him, in as far as they form one teaching body; (2) by the Pope alone, when he speaks *ex cathedra,* i.e., when as Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the whole Church.

1. The *one* teaching body in the Church exercises its office whether its members are scattered over the world or are assembled in an oecumenical council for deliberation in common. Whatever is taught as revealed truth by this teaching body, whether in one or the other form, must be accepted and believed as such.

2. Papal infallibility was defined by the Vatican Council in the following terms: "Faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian Faith, we . . . teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra,* i.e., when in discharging the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, by reason of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole Church, he, by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed *Peter,* possesses that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the said Roman Pontiff are of themselves unalterable and not from the consent of the Church."

The Pope is therefore not infallible when he gives a decision as man, bishop, scholar, preacher, or confessor, nor when he expresses an opinion on questions of art, politics, or secular

science. Infallibility is quite distinct from personal impeccability.

That the Pope is infallible when he officially defines a doctrine affecting faith or morals is evident:

1. From those passages of Holy Scripture in which it is recorded that Christ conferred upon *Peter* (and in him upon all his successors) the supremacy over His Church.

2. From the testimony of the early Church.

3. From the decisions of Councils.

4. From the actual recognition, in every century, of the Pope's authority to teach the Church.

1. "Thou art Peter," etc. (Matth. xvi, 18); "Feed my lambs" (John xxi, 15–17); "I have prayed for thee" (Luke xxii, 32). The Primacy was instituted to secure the unity of the Church, and especially uniformity in her doctrine. This aim could not be realized unless the Pope, in his teaching capacity, possessed an infallible authority, binding on the conscience of men. At any moment questions may arise on matters of faith requiring immediate decision. It would not be possible to summon a general council on every such occasion, and consequently the Pope alone must have power to give an authoritative answer.

2. *St. Irenaeus* writes: "With this Church [of Peter], on account of its higher prerogative, the whole Church, viz., all the faithful, wherever they may be, must agree." (adv. haer., 3. 3.) *St. Cyprian* speaks of the Roman Church as "inaccessible to errors in doctrine," and *St. Augustine* says: "On the seat of unity God established the doctrine of truth." (*In cathedra unitatis posuit Deus doctrinam veritatis.*)

3. The Eighth General Council, held at Constantinople in 869, confirmed the confession of faith drawn up by Pope *Hormisdas* and signed by two hundred and fifty Greek and Latin bishops, and added: "The whole stability of the Christian religion depends upon union with the apostolic [i.e., Roman] see." The Fourteenth Council, held at Lyons in 1274, declared: "It is the privilege of the Roman Pontiff to give a final decision on matters of faith." The Seventeenth Council, held at Florence in 1439, stated: "The Roman Pontiff is the Head of the whole Church, the Father and Teacher of all Christians."

4. The verdict of Rome when rejecting a new doctrine has

always been considered as final. Hence *St. Augustine's* famous saying (sermo, 131) : "*Roma locuta, causa finita.*" The decisions of councils, whether general or particular, were not regarded as binding until the Pope had confirmed them. When disputes arose concerning matters of faith, bishops in every age and place have referred them to Rome for decision, and even heretics have invariably sought to obtain from Rome an expression of opinions favourable to themselves.

The Roman see has never erred in giving a dogmatic decision. Pope *Liberius* is said to have signed an ambiguous (Arian) confession of faith, and *Honorius* is supposed to have given utterance to monothelite heresy in his letters to *Sergius;* but these statements are untenable, and the orthodoxy of both Popes has been proved beyond all doubt. Nor can any argument be based upon the trial of *Galileo.* Moreover in all these instances there is question only of private decisions, and to such matters papal infallibility does not apply.

The Church, the Necessary Means of Salvation

Christ founded only one Church and commissioned her to make known His doctrine and dispense His graces. This is the Roman Catholic Church, which alone has received from Christ full authority and the means of bringing men to salvation.

1. Just as Christ alone is our Saviour, so is His Church the only institution whereby we can be saved. The saying "Outside the Church there is no salvation" means that no Church except the Catholic can secure a man's salvation. If, then, any one not outwardly belonging to the Church is saved, he is not saved through his own Church, but through the true Church of Christ, to which he must inwardly (i.e., in desire) belong.

2. This statement is a logical deduction from the fact that Christ founded but one Church, and there is nothing invidious about it. A body of Christians that does not claim this prerogative cannot claim to be the one, true Church, and consequently cannot maintain that it is incumbent upon any one to join it.

Every human being is bound, under penalty of losing his soul, to become a member of the Catholic Church,

to believe what she teaches, to avail himself of the means of grace that she offers, and to submit to her authority. This obligation was stated by Christ Himself when He said: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Matth. xviii, 17.)

1. We are admitted to the Church and receive the grace of faith at our baptism, and this grace is nourished by a Christian education and developed so that it becomes an individual possession. Any member of the Church who, by his own fault, abandons her will be lost.

2. Whoever does not belong to the Church and is aware of the fact is strictly bound to seek the true Church and, having found her, to join her communion. *St. Cyprian* says: "No one can have God as his Father who has not the Church as his mother. Just as no one could find safety except in Noe's ark, so no one can find salvation outside the Church." (de Cath. eccl. un., 6.) *St. Augustine* writes: "He who possesses the Holy Spirit is within the Church, and he who is outside the Church possesses not the Holy Spirit." (sermo, 268, 2.) At the Synod of Cirta in 412 the African bishops, together with *St. Augustine*, decided: "He who is separated from the Catholic Church will not have life, because he is cut off from Christ; he may suppose himself to live in a most praiseworthy manner, but the wrath of God hangs over him."

From the doctrine that membership of the Catholic Church is necessary for salvation, as well as from that regarding the body and soul of the Church (cf. p. 162 and 163), we may deduce the following conclusions:

1. No one can be saved who, by his own fault, is cut off from the Catholic Church so completely as to belong neither to the soul nor to the body of the Church.

2. No one can be saved in virtue of merely outward connection with the Church, i.e., by belonging only to the body and not to the soul of the Church.

3. Any one who, by no fault of his own, is in error

and, though not belonging to the body, belongs to the soul of the Church, can be saved.

1. One who is in error by no fault of his own is deprived of many means of grace offered by the Church, and therefore it is more difficult for him to be saved than for a Catholic. He does not participate in the holy sacrifice of the Mass, he cannot receive Holy Communion, sacramental absolution, or the last sacraments.

2. Heathens, who through no fault of their own are completely ignorant of Christianity, can be saved if they live according to their conscience and repent of their sins. "God will have all men to be saved." (1 Tim. ii, 4.) He does not withhold from them the grace that they need in order to attain to justification if they coöperate with it. They belong, at least in desire, to the Church of Christ. Hence it is our duty to pray earnestly for all who "sit in darkness and in the shadow of death" (Luke i, 79) and to do our utmost to cause the light of truth to shine upon them.

To decide whether any person is or is not to blame for remaining outside the Church rests not with men, but with God, who alone searches the heart (Ps. vii, 10) and will judge the secrets of men (Rom. ii, 16). We should be guided by the principle: "Charity thinketh no evil." (1 Cor. xiii, 5.)

The happiness of belonging to the Catholic Church. Every one who by God's grace has been brought up in the Catholic faith will say with the Psalmist: "Blessed are they that dwell in thy house, O Lord; they shall praise thee for ever and ever." (Ps. lxxxiii, 5.) He realizes that he belongs to the Church of Christ.

1. The Catholic Church is Christ's own foundation and was built by our Lord and His apostles; she will continue until the end of the world. The Protestant historian *Macaulay* writes as follows: "No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when camelopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the supreme pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned *Napoleon* in the nineteenth century to the Pope

who crowned *Pepin* in the eighth; and far beyond the time of *Pepin* the august dynasty extends, until it is lost in the twilight of fable. The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern when compared with the Papacy; and the republic of Venice is gone, and the Papacy remains. The Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour. . . . Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world, and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Greek eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the Temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's . . . The Arabs have a fable that the Great Pyramid was built by antediluvian kings, and alone of all the works of men bore the weight of the flood. Such as this was the fate of the Papacy. It had been buried under the great inundation, but its deep foundations had remained unshaken, and, when the waters abated, it appeared alone amidst the ruins of a world which had passed away. The republic of Holland was gone, and the empire of Germany, and the Great Council of Venice, and the old Helvetian League, and the House of Bourbon, and the parliaments and aristocracy of France. . . . But the unchangeable Church was still there."

2. The Catholic Church teaches the truth about Christ. With jealous care she guards Holy Scripture and makes it possible for all her children to know the words and deeds of our Lord as recorded in the gospels; hence she is the true Church of the real Christ. She has preserved from age to age the divine authority of her Founder and applies to each individual the fruits of His Redemption. In and by His Church our Saviour continues His work, so that she carries on the active work of Christ; she enjoys His eucharistic presence and brings her children within its influence.

3. The Catholic Church possesses the whole of our Lord's teaching; under the guidance of the Holy Ghost in the course of centuries she has developed His doctrine on faith and morals into a wonderful structure, each detail of which is as essential and firm as the stones in a Gothic cathedral. Even the enemies

of the Church are amazed at what she has accomplished by God's help. *Marheineke,* a Protestant, says: "In other respects we stand outside the Catholic Church and survey her wonderful structure only historically, studying it from its foundation to its topmost pinnacle with all its joints and articulations; but we must acknowledge that neither in philosophy nor in science have we met with any teaching institution built with such unerring certainty in accordance with the foundation originally laid, nor one whose design has been carried out, even in the smallest details, with so much skill, intelligence, and consistency, and on which the human (or rather the divine) mind has for so many centuries displayed its supreme powers in so high a degree." "The Catholic doctrines are members of one family and suggestive, or correlative, or confirmatory, or illustrative of each other. . . . You must accept the whole or reject the whole." (*Newman.*)

4. The Catholic Church possesses all the means of grace bestowed by Christ, and in the number of her sacraments, her magnificent liturgy, the festivals of the ecclesiastical year, her confraternities, and devotions she affords abundant satisfaction to the cravings of the human soul. "I have seen a good many Roman Catholics on their dying beds, and it always appeared to me that they accepted the inevitable with a composure which showed that their belief, whether or not the best to live by, was a better one to die by than most of the harder creeds which have replaced it." (*O. W. Holmes.*)

5. The Catholic Church enjoys the liberty of Christ. In virtue of her divine institution she is independent of all secular authority and has preserved her independence inviolate in every age and place. She is the Bride of Christ, subservient to none. "The State Church, controlled by the government of the country, fails to appeal to the people, because they regard her as a serviceable instrument in the hands of the State, and responsible for all the blunders and faults of the secular power. How much more favourable in this respect is the position of the Roman Catholic Church! She at least has never been looked upon as the tool of the government, and she never consents to an unworthy alliance with it." (*Schenkel,* a Protestant, ap. *Hettinger,* Apol., II, 163.)

6. The Catholic Church displays the fruits of Christ's spirit. Everywhere she has put down barbarism, raised the standard of morality, and promoted the arts and sciences. "Amidst the infinite number of conflicting races, nations, languages, customs, and ideas, and encompassed by the gloom of sensuality and pride,

the ancient world witnessed the growth of a people that cared nothing for barriers of rivers or mountains and from one end of the world to the other thought and desired the same things. The North greeted the South, and the East said to the West: 'I know who thou art.' The poor man took his place beside the rich and gave no offence. The philosopher was taught by the artisan, the humble loved the noble, and the noble the humble; the educated dried the tears of the savage; for every kind of misery kindly assistance was forthcoming, and misery was but an opportunity for the exercise of charity. Countless virgins were dedicated to the service of God, hermits formed large communities, martyrs were more powerful than kings, force gave way to weakness, and the slaves were released, without even having demanded their freedom,—and all this because the Catholic Church had appeared on the world's stage." (*Lacordaire.*)

Every ancient city in Europe bears testimony to the care with which the Church fostered architecture; in every library we can trace her zeal for learning, and in every museum her encouragement of painting and sculpture. Artists lavished their skill upon the manuscripts and vessels used in the churches and upon the adornment of God's house. Agriculture, gardening, and manufactures owed their development to the religious orders. Universities and schools of every kind were founded and supported by the Church. Centuries before any secular centres of learning and civilization existed the Church had been the great civilizing force in the world, and countless scholars and artists in every age have been not merely faithful, but pious and zealous Catholics. (See *Kneller,* Christianity and the leaders of Modern Science; *J. Walsh,* Catholic Churchmen in Science; The Thirteenth Greatest of Centuries.)

7. The Catholic Church possesses and imparts the peace of Christ. In the course of the last hundred years a vast number of educated persons in England, America, and Germany have embraced Catholicism, and many of these converts have recorded the fact that they have thus found peace and happiness. *Leo Krüger* (born in Berlin, 1817), professor of Oriental languages, writes: "I cannot find words in which to express my happiness; the Catholic faith is the Eden purchased for us with His Blood by the Son of God." *K. Ernst Jarcke,* professor of jurisprudence in Berlin and Bonn, said on his deathbed: "When I am dead, tell everyone who will listen that I found my supreme happiness in the Church of Rome, and that my anger was aroused whenever any one attacked her."

Professor *Alb. von Ruville* of Halle, who was received into

the Church in 1910, writes: "No sooner had this [i.e., my adoption of the Catholic faith] taken place than I experienced in a hitherto unexpected manner the blessing that it bestowed. I was filled with such joy and happiness as no worldly achievements had ever given me. Our Lord's words in the Apocalypse, 'Behold, I make all things new,' seemed to be realized in my case, for everything around me, nature, life, and my fellow-creatures, had acquired a new and previously unknown radiance. Much that had formerly appeared insignificant now possessed a high value and became a source of pure joy. . . . All these delightful experiences convinced me, not merely intellectually, but in the depths of my soul, that for the attainment of peace of mind, true happiness, and assured judgment in all the difficulties of life, it is necessary to have faith in dogmatic truth, and that not only does this faith involve an effort to acquire moral perfection, but no real morality can exist without it." (*Ruville,* Back to Holy Church.) "Upon becoming a Catholic the first thing which struck me was the extraordinary sense of intellectual freedom which the change gave me. My whole mental horizon became widened, and many events of history and movements of human thought had a light thrown on them which revealed a purpose and relation hitherto unnoticed." (*R. F. Wilson.*)

8. The Catholic faith affords the greatest consolation at death. This has been acknowledged by all who, after going astray for a time, have been reconciled to the Church on their deathbed. The great composer *Chopin* with tears professed his faith and, as he kissed his crucifix, exclaimed: "Now I have reached the source of all happiness." "I will add that I would not be outside of the fold of Christ's flock which he confided to *Peter* for one hour in exchange for the whole universe; for in that hour I might die." (*H. F. Fairbanks.*)

The Communion of Saints

By the Communion of Saints we mean the spiritual union existing between the faithful on earth, the blessed in heaven, and the souls in purgatory.

1. The faithful on earth, who are members of the Catholic Church, form the Church Militant, the souls in purgatory the Church Suffering, and the blessed in heaven the Church Triumphant; yet these are not three distinct Churches, but one in three different conditions.

2. The members of this Church are called saints because God

desires the sanctification of each individual; all are sanctified by baptism, and many have already attained to perfect holiness.

The spiritual union of the faithful rests upon the fact that all are members of one body, of which Christ is the Head; hence every one shares in the spiritual treasures of all.

"For as in one body we have many members . . . so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." (Rom. xii, 4, 5.) "He [Christ] is the head of the body, the Church." (Col. i, 18.)

Many advantages result from the union of all the members of the three divisions of the Church:

1. We can benefit by the merits acquired on earth by those who are now blessed in heaven, and by their intercession with God on our behalf.

2. We can help the souls in purgatory by our prayers, alms, and good works, and especially by the holy sacrifice of the Mass and by indulgences.

Judas Machabaeus "making a gathering, sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead. . . . It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." (2 Mach. xii, 43, 46.) The earliest Fathers of the Church bear testimony to the fact that from the very beginning prayer has always been offered for the dead, and the oldest liturgies contain such prayers. The schismatic Greeks observe, in this respect, the same custom as Catholics.

3. We participate in *all* the Masses, prayers, and good works of the whole Church and in all her spiritual benefits.

"God hath tempered the body together . . . that there might be no schism in the body, but the members might be mutually careful one for another. . . . You are the body of Christ, and members of member." (1 Cor. xii, 24–27.) Sinners, though not formally excluded from the Church, are nevertheless dead members and forfeit most of their spiritual advantages; yet in virtue

of their connection with the Church they retain certain graces, which make conversion easier for them than for others.

II. THE CHURCH AND THE SOURCES OF OUR FAITH

Inspiration and Canon of Holy Scripture

Divine revelation reaches us through two channels, viz., Holy Scripture and tradition. It is the duty of the Church to bear witness to the truth derived from these two sources, to expound it, and to preserve it pure and incorrupt.

Holy Scripture consists of the Old and the New Testament. They cannot contain any error because they were inspired, i.e., written under the influence of the Holy Ghost, so that God is their author. Hence they are rightly called "the word of God."

Inspiration includes both a positive and a negative action on the part of God: (1) He infused into the mind of the person who was to be the human author of a book the truths that He desired to be written; (2) He influenced the will of the human author so that he wrote down these truths and these only; (3) He assisted the human author to record these truths without error and in suitable language. God did not, as it were, dictate each single word to the writers (verbal inspiration), but as a rule He left the choice of language to them, only so far intervening that they would record the inspired truths accurately and appropriately. Hence in the gospels, for instance, all the evangelists often agree in the fact stated, but each employs his own characteristic language. In spite of this, however, the words of Holy Scripture were prompted by the Holy Ghost and are therefore sacred.

The inspiration of Holy Scripture is proved:

1. From Holy Scripture itself.

"For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time, but the holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter i, 21.) "Well did the Holy Ghost speak to our fathers by *Isaias* the prophet." (Acts xxviii, 25.) *St. Paul* speaks of

"scripture inspired of God" (2 Tim. iii, 16), and *St. Peter* numbers amongst the "other scriptures" of this class the epistles of *St. Paul* (2 Peter iii, 15, 14).

2. From tradition.

St. Clement of Rome (ep. ad Cor., 45) calls the books of the Old Testament "true utterances of the Holy Ghost"; *St. Justin Martyr* (apol., i, 36) speaks of the prophets as "inspired by the Logos," and *St. Clement* of Alexandria (strom., ix, 345) says that the books of Holy Scripture are "divine utterances."

3. From the teaching of the Church.

At the Vatican Council the Church declared that she regarded the books of the Old and the New Testament as sacred, "not for this reason, that they were composed by unaided human industry, and subsequently approved of by her authority; nor for this reason also, that they contain the revelation without error; but because they have been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and have God for their author, and have been transmitted to the Church as such." (Conc. Vat., sess. 3, c. 2.)

The collection and list of all the inspired writings is known as the canon of Holy Scripture.

1. There is not in the Bible any list of all the inspired books, although occasionally references to or quotations from various books occur.

In the early Church heretics circulated several uncanonical books, and there were many good, but uninspired writings, which some of the faithful regarded as sacred, whilst the divine inspiration of others was questioned. In order to decide once for all which books were to be recognized as divinely inspired, a list or canon was drawn up by Pope *Damasus* and the Council of Hippo in Africa (393), confirmed by Pope *Innocent I* (405), by the Council of Trent, and recently by the Vatican Council.

The schismatic Greek Church and the other separated sects of the East (Nestorians, Eutychians) are in complete accord with the Catholic Church regarding the canon of Holy Scripture.

2. *The canon of the Old Testament.* The Jews of course recognize only the Old Testament as sacred and accept only the books that have been preserved in Hebrew or Aramaic; they reject those that were written and have been preserved in Greek. In making this distinction modern Jews are at variance with their forefathers, who read the Septuagint translation in their

synagogues. The books of the Old Testament are divided into protocanonical and deuterocanonical. To the former class belong all those contained in the Hebrew Bible; to the latter, those that have come down to us only in Greek, viz., Baruch, Tobias, Judith, Machabees, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, chapters xi–xvi of the book of Esther, and three chapters (iii, xiii, xiv) of Daniel.

The Church does not discriminate between protocanonical and deuterocanonical books, for the apostles used the Septuagint and regarded all the books that it contains as sacred. Hence the Church, having received these books from them, is bound to preserve the whole number intact.

Protestants follow the Jews and call the deuterocanonical books "apocryphal," not authentic, and uninspired. In so doing they are opposed to the whole of Christian antiquity. The Fathers of the Church (*Cyprian, Tertullian, Ephrem, Augustine*) quote all the books now contained in the canon without any distinction, and in the Roman catacombs there are paintings representing scenes from the deuterocanonical books, such as Tobias and Machabees.

3. *The canon of the New Testament.* Certain books of the New Testament canon were in the third and fourth centuries regarded as of doubtful authenticity. These were the epistles of St. James and St. Jude, the second and third epistles of St. John, the second epistle of St. Peter, the epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, but from the fifth century onwards all have been recognized as canonical, as they had been by the whole Church before any controversy arose about them. The same books were rejected by many of the Reformers, but at the present time most Protestants accept the entire New Testament, although some have abandoned all idea of inspiration, and consequently look upon the Bible as in no sense holy.

4. The earliest known list of the books in the New Testament occurs in the Muratorian Fragment, copied in Rome in the eighth century from a second century manuscript. It was discovered by Muratori in 1740 in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. A list of the books recognized by the Church as belonging to the Old Testament occurs in the *Codex Claramontanus,* a sixth century manuscript, copied from one of the third century. Several of the Fathers also enumerate these books. The Itala translation, dating from the first and second centuries, contains all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, proving that these have always been read by the Church. The Coptic and other early translations contain the same books.

Tradition

Holy Scripture is not the sole source of faith; tradition is of equal importance.

The word "tradition" is used in a twofold sense:

1. In its wider signification tradition is all the truth handed down by our forefathers, including all God's revelation, whether written or not; in this sense Holy Scripture forms part of tradition.

2. In its narrower signification tradition is truth handed down by word of mouth, and thus it includes only the revelation that is not contained in Holy Scripture. In this sense tradition is supplementary to Holy Scripture.

In this section the word is used only in the second, narrower signification.

Holy Scripture cannot be the sole source of faith, since it does not contain the whole of God's revelation. This is plain from the following considerations:

1. Christ neither wrote anything Himself nor did He commission His apostles to write and require people to learn how to read.

"Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature." (Mark xvi, 15.)

2. The apostles did not all write books, and those who did so wrote only after a considerable time and as occasion required. The apostles and evangelists did not record all that our Lord did and far less all that He said.

St. John says: "Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of his disciples, which are not written in this book." (John xx, 30.) *St. Paul* admonishes his converts to "stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle." (2 Thess. ii, 14.) If we were guided by the Bible alone, we should observe the Sabbath day rather than Sunday, we should refrain from things strangled and from blood (Acts xv, 20), and we should not baptize children until they had reached the age of discretion. (Matth. xxviii, 19.)

3. Christianity existed and was in a flourishing condition before any of the books of the New Testament were written.

"Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." (Rom. x, 17.) Even in the time of *St. Irenaeus* (ob. 202) there were several Christian nations that did not possess the sacred scriptures, just as at the present time, in missionary countries, faith may be firmly planted long before the Bible is translated into the vernacular.

4. Holy Scripture itself takes tradition for granted. The Bible nowhere tells us which books are to be recognized as sacred, so we know this only by tradition. Without tradition there would be no Holy Scripture.

"Whoever declares the written word of the New Testament to be the supreme source of knowledge regarding faith maintains it to be something that by its very nature it cannot be, that in accordance with the Lord's design it is not intended to be, and that by its own testimony it does not aim at being; and, I may add, he declares it to be something which it was never regarded as being in the early centuries when Christianity was in its full vigour, and which it has actually never been." (*Delbrück,* a Protestant theologian.)

"Scripture was never intended to teach doctrine to the many; and if it was not given with this object, it argues no imperfection in it that it does not fulfil it." (*Newman,* The Via Media.)

By tradition we understand those revealed truths which the apostles preached, but did not record in writing. The word is derived from *tradere,* to hand down, because a knowledge of these truths was handed down from generation to generation.

"The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii, 2.)

Tradition possesses divine sanction, since the truths handed down by word of mouth were revealed by God no less than those contained in Holy Scripture.

1. The apostles preached nothing but what was re-

vealed to them by Christ or, after His ascension, by "the Spirit of Truth."

2. They preached under the guidance of the Holy Ghost and were thus preserved from all error.

3. God confirmed the truth of their preaching by miracles.

"Going therefore teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matth. xxviii, 19, 20.) "The Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." (John xiv, 26.)

Tradition has come down to us through various channels:

1. Through oral instruction.

2. Through the practices and customs of the Church.

3. In the writings of the Fathers and other ecclesiastical records.

4. In the liturgy and acts of the martyrs.

5. In the creeds of the Church.

1. Since Christ commissioned His apostles to preach, not to write His doctrine (Mark xvi, 15; Matth. xxviii, 19), they regarded it as their special task to give oral instruction, not to compile or circulate books. The tidings of salvation were made known to the whole world orally and handed down from one generation to another.

2. The practices and customs of the Church are extremely ancient, especially such as are universal, and they give expression to the faith of the Church. In the case of some it is possible to prove that they originated with the apostles; in that of others, that they existed at a very early date. Of these *St. Augustine* says: "What the whole Church accepts, not instituted by councils, but having always been observed, is most justly regarded as handed down by apostolic authority." (de bapt., l. IV, c. 24.)

3. By the Fathers of the Church we mean ecclesiastical writers who lived before the year 600 and who enjoy a particular repu-

tation for learning and sanctity. They are regarded as witnesses to tradition, and their writings contain the faith inherited from the apostles. Their testimony is the more important inasmuch as most of them did not merely commit to writing the doctrines of the Church, but defended these doctrines against the attacks of her enemies. Any doctrine regarding which the Fathers agree unanimously must be regarded as the doctrine of the Church. The earliest witnesses to tradition are the *apostolic Fathers,* who were more or less contemporaries of the apostles. These are: *Clement* of Rome, *Barnabas, Ignatius* of Antioch, *Polycarp* of Smyrna, *Hermas* and *Papias.* They were followed by the earliest apologists or defenders of Christianity: *Justin Martyr* (ob. 166), *Irenaeus* of Lyons (ob. 202), *Tertullian* (ob. about 220), and *Origen* (ob. 254).

Further witnesses to tradition are the doctors of the Church. The Greek doctors are: *Athanasius* (ob. 373), *Basil* (ob. 379), *Cyril* of Jerusalem (ob. 386), *Gregory Nazianzen* (ob. 390), *John Chrysostom* (ob. 407), and *Cyril* of Alexandria (ob. 444). The Latin doctors are: *Ambrose* (ob. 397), *Jerome* (ob. 420), *Augustine* (ob. 430), Pope *Leo I* the Great (ob. 461), and Pope *Gregory I* the Great (ob. 604).

A few later authors also possess the title of doctor; they are: *Anselm* (ob. 1109), *Bernard* (ob. 1158), *Thomas Aquinas* (ob. 1274), *Bonaventure* (ob. 1274), *Francis* of Sales (ob. 1622), *Alphonsus Liguori* (ob. 1787), and some others. They are not Fathers of the Church, for this title is given only to those who lived in the first six centuries.

In addition to the written records of Christian antiquity mention may be made of the sculptures and paintings in the Roman catacombs and elsewhere. The early Christians were in the habit of adorning their coffins with sculptures and their tombs with paintings, and most of the articles of our faith are symbolically represented there.

4. The earliest liturgies and acts of the martyrs are of very great importance. By liturgies we mean the works dealing with the ritual to be observed at public worship, such books being compiled with the sanction of the Church. The prayers that they contain and the ceremonies that they prescribe bear witness to the faith of the various churches. For instance, we have the liturgies of the Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων (second century), those of the *canones apostolorum* (third century), those of *St. Basil* and *St. John Chrysostom,* and the early English, the Ambrosian, the Gothic (Mozarabic), and Gallic liturgies. They show that although there was great diversity in outward usage, there was absolute uniformity of belief.

The *Acta Martyrum* are records of the heroic confession of faith and of the holy deaths of those who died as martyrs. Christians were careful to commit to writing the examination which the martyrs had to undergo, and from their replies we are able to discover the truths for which these witnesses to Christ shed their blood.

5. The creeds of the Church contain the most important points of Catholic faith. They were compiled partly for purposes of instruction and partly to give an explicit statement of Catholic doctrine, such a statement being rendered necessary by the growth of heresies. Hence the creeds lay particular emphasis upon the points defined by general councils. The chief creeds of the Church are:

(*a*) *The Apostles' Creed,* dating from the time of the apostles. It was probably composed in order to facilitate the task of preaching the Christian faith.

(*b*) *The Nicene Creed,* in which special stress is laid upon the faith of the Church in the Divinity of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, as defined by the Council of Nicaea in 325 against the teaching of *Arius.* It emphasizes also the Divinity of the Third Person, as defined by the Council of Constantinople in 381 against *Macedonius.* This creed is said at Mass.

(*c*) *The Athanasian Creed,* or Symbolum Quicunque, derives its name from *St. Athanasius,* although it is uncertain whether he or *St. Ambrose* was the author. It contains a very explicit statement of the Church's teaching regarding the Blessed Trinity and the Person of Christ.

(*d*) *The Tridentine Creed,* or *Creed of Pope Pius IV,* was composed at the conclusion of the Council of Trent to counteract the heretical doctrines of the sixteenth century. A few supplementary words were added by Pope *Pius IX* referring to the supremacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. This creed is the most detailed of all and is used when formal profession is made of the Catholic faith.

III. THE CHURCH AND THE CHRISTIAN RULE OF FAITH

The Rule of Faith

By a rule of faith is meant the criterion according to which every one can know what God has revealed and in what sense His revelation is to be understood.

A rule of faith is indispensable; Christ did not intend His doctrine to be only for the apostles and their contemporaries, but for all mankind in every age and place. It was necessary, therefore, to insure to all men the possibility of knowing what He revealed and of understanding it correctly.

Holy Scripture cannot be the universal rule of faith.

1. It does not contain *all* the truths revealed to men.

2. The revealed truths that it contains are not in a form intelligible to all men. The Bible is a mysterious book, and there are in it, as according to *St. Peter* there are in the epistles of *St. Paul,* "things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction." (2 Peter iii, 16.) We require a rule of faith if we are to interpret it aright.

History teaches us that the sects, which admit of no other rule of faith than the Bible, are continually splitting up and cannot agree even on the most important points. Private interpretation of Holy Scriptures leads to diversity of faith and ultimately to indifference and unbelief. "Heresies arise because Holy Scripture, though in itself good, is not easily understood, and heretics rashly and audaciously insist upon what they do not properly understand in it." (*St. Augustine,* Jo. tract., 18, 1.) "The Bible is the book in which each individual seeks and discovers his own dogmas." (*Warenfels,* a Protestant theologian, ob. 1740.)

The rule of faith for every individual is the teaching of the Church that Christ founded. He commissioned her to teach, and required all men to accept her teaching. (cf. p. 173.) This is apparent:

1. *From Christ's own mode of action.*

He wrote nothing, but gave oral instruction and called upon all men to accept it unconditionally. "He that believeth in the Son hath life everlasting; but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John iii, 36.)

2. *From the orders given by Christ.*

He commanded His apostles to preach, not to write; He promised them the assistance of the Holy Spirit and made it incumbent upon all men to accept their doctrine. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matth. xxviii, 18–20.) "I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever." (John xiv, 16.) "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me. And he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." (Luke x, 16.) "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark xvi, 16.)

3. *From the apostles' mode of action.*

In accordance with the orders given them by our Lord, the apostles regarded it as their special duty to preach the word of God, and they commanded others carefully to preserve their doctrines. They in their turn transmitted to others their authority to teach, bidding them continue to do so "until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Keep the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in us." (2 Tim. i, 14.) "The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii, 2.)

The Church has always recognized, as the only valid rule of faith, the interpretation of revealed truth given by her teaching authority.

1. From the earliest ages it has been regarded as an undisputed principle that the bishops, who have succeeded the apostles in uninterrupted succession, are the visible instruments provided for the preservation and propagation of Christ's teaching.

"You must agree with the bishops' instructions, for we are bound to receive the person sent by the head of the household to direct his family in the same way as we should receive the master who sends him. It is therefore clear that we ought so to

attend to the bishop as to the Master Himself." (*St. Ignatius,* martyr ad Ephes.)

"O Timothy, keep the deposit, avoiding profane novelties of words. . . . Who is the Timothy of to-day but either generally the Universal Church or in particular the whole body of the Prelacy, whom it behooves either themselves to possess or to communicate to others a complete knowledge of religion?" (*Vincent of Lérins,* Commonit. c., xxii.)

2. Where the doctrine taught by the apostles is accepted, there is agreement:

(*a*) Of the various churches with one another. "The mark of the true doctrine is that all agree one with another, and are not at variance either among themselves or with the Fathers." (*Athanasius,* de decr. Nic., n. 4.)

(*b*) With each church founded by the apostles. "We are in communion with the churches founded by the apostles, because no one teaches a doctrine differing from theirs; this is the proof of truth." (*Tertullian,* Praescr., c. 21.)

(*c*) With the Church of *Peter* in Rome. "With the Church of *Peter* on account of her superior position the whole Church [i.e., the faithful wherever they may be] must agree. She has at all times and under all circumstances preserved the tradition that has come down from the apostles." (*Irenaeus,* adv. haer., 3, 3.)

Lessing, a Protestant, in speaking of the Catholic rule of faith, says: "The substance of the creeds is called by the early Fathers the rule of faith, *Regula fidei.* This Regula, and not the Scriptures, is the rock upon which the Church of Christ was built. . . . Not only was the history of Christ known before it was recorded by the evangelists, but the whole religion of Christ was active before one of them began to write. The Lord's prayer was in use before it could be read in *St. Matthew's* gospel, for Jesus Himself had taught it to His disciples. The baptismal formula was employed before *St. Matthew* committed it to writing, for Christ Himself had ordered His apostles to use it."

"At the same time, and this is a second conclusion no less important and well ascertained than the one just mentioned, the dogmatic teaching of the Bible was never meant to be, and in point of fact never was, the only and supreme standard of belief. . . . In the New Testament the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, and its ministers are the messengers of God, the authorized interpreters of His word." (*Gigot,* Biblical Lectures.)

The rule of faith and freedom of research. In all depart-

ments of human knowledge it is perfectly justifiable that research should be unimpeded, but supernatural faith lies outside the sphere of natural knowledge, because it is unattainable by man's unaided faculties. If then the Church requires us to submit our judgment to her authority in matters of faith and morals as well as in the interpretation of Holy Scripture, she is not restricting a rational use of our liberty. The Church, being under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, is incapable of error, and it is her right and duty to guard men from error where their highest interests are at stake. When in matters of faith we voluntarily renounce all claim to private judgment and obey the Church, we are insuring ourselves against the danger of going astray. To protect oneself against danger does not involve any renunciation of liberty, but it shows a reasonable use of liberty.

Two important conclusions follow from what has been said regarding the rule of faith.

1. The Catholic faith is based primarily upon the teaching authority of the Church. A Catholic believes all that God has revealed (object of faith) and by the agency of the Church proposes to us for belief (rule of faith).

A Catholic does not expect a special divine inspiration enabling him to recognize revealed truths as such, nor does he assume that he can discover revealed truths by his own research. He accepts the revealed truths on the authority of the Church.

2. Holy Scripture forms part of the teaching inherited by the Church and is therefore subject to her authority.

1. It is a mistake to suppose that some of the truths revealed to us have reached us exclusively through the channel of Holy Scripture and others exclusively through that of tradition. We possess the whole revelation by way of tradition, but a part of it has also come down to us in writing. We would still possess the whole of God's revelation if Holy Scripture did not exist. Holy Scripture is not absolutely necessary for the preservation of revealed truth; it is, however, a very suitable means, designed by Divine Providence, of facilitating the preservation and diffusion of God's revelation.

2. The authority of Holy Scripture is derived in the first

instance, not from the Church, but from God, who inspired the writers. The Church cannot propose to us for belief anything contrary to Holy Scripture; yet she exercises control over it, because it is the written word, entrusted to her by God, so that she may guard and interpret it.

The Church rightly demands that no one, relying on his private judgment, should venture to interpret Holy Scripture, on points connected with faith and morals, according to his own opinion and in a sense opposed to that accepted by the Church and to the unanimous teaching of the Fathers. (Conc. Trid., sess. 4; Vatic., sess. 3, c. 2.)

To interpret Holy Scripture in a manner contrary to the meaning assigned to it by the Church is to claim to understand it better than the Holy Ghost, who assists the Church to discern its true meaning. The unanimous teaching of the Fathers is the teaching of Christ and His Church.

The Church has never prohibited the reading of Holy Scripture, but has recommended it to all who possess the requisite degree of learning and piety.

1. All are permitted to read Holy Scripture in the original and in ancient translations, provided that they are published by Catholics, and those engaged in theological and biblical studies are allowed to use translations published by non-Catholics.

2. All are permitted to use translations into the vernacular that have been approved by the Holy See or prepared under episcopal supervision and are provided with suitable elucidations. (Constit., "Officiorum ac munerum," Jan. 25, 1897.)

1. The Church earnestly desires the faithful to know and love God's Word; hence she is far from wishing to withhold it from them, and only tries to protect them from using falsified translations, such as are often offered to unsuspicious Catholics, and from erroneous interpretations, which lead to schism and heresy.

"If we survey this whole period [the Middle Ages] we find no hint of a general prohibition of Bible reading on the part of the laity. . . . It is true, however, that in some countries, where heretical tendencies prevailed, fresh translations of the Bible were made and circulated, and their use was forbidden both by provincial synods and by secular rulers. On the other hand we can trace in Germany a lively interest in promoting the practice of reading the Bible, dating from the end of the fourteenth century and especially after 1466; this was not due to any heretical influence." (*G. Rietschel.*) "We seek in vain, in the records of mediaeval centuries, for any act of the Church, in Her councils, tending even indirectly to prevent or impede the reading and diffusion of authentic versions of the unmutilated Scriptures." (*L. A. Buckingham,* The Bible in the Middle Ages.) It was not until 1229 that the first authoritative restriction on Bible reading was passed by a council held at Toulouse. Inasmuch as heretics of the time mutilated the Bible in order to propagate their errors, the council forbade the possession by laymen of the sacred books, especially in the vernacular. (*Gigot,* Biblical Lectures.)

2. The Bible is a source of faith, whence we may learn the truths necessary for salvation, if it is used in accordance with the rules laid down by Christ, but it is not intended to be read indiscriminately. Suitable extracts from the epistles and gospels, and books on Bible history abound. *Leo XIII* granted an indulgence of three hundred days to all who read the gospel for a quarter of an hour, and a plenary indulgence once a month to all who read it daily for this space of time. (Dec. 18, 1898.)

Necessity of Faith

Faith is absolutely indispensable to salvation, as "without faith it is impossible to please God." (Hebr. xi, 6.)

That it is the duty of every human being to profess the Christian faith is obvious when we consider the subject, object, contents, and aim of revelation.

1. God has revealed Himself, and therefore any rejection of divinely revealed truth is a revolt against God, our supreme Lord.

2. What is revealed is the word of God, and there-

fore He must require of us the unconditional surrender of our finite intelligence to His truth, which cannot lead us astray.

3. Revelation teaches us the manner in which God desires us to know, love, and worship Him. And every man is bound to serve God as He will have it.

4. God's revelation is intended to make it possible for us to regain the happiness that we have lost. Unless we accept the revealed truths we cannot reach our goal, i.e., everlasting salvation.

Faith is essential for human society in general as well as for each individual.

Religion and ethics. It has been asserted that ethics can exist independently of all religion (~~autonomous morality, ethical culture~~) and that such a system is superior to morality based on religion. Such views have been propagated by the various ethical societies. A purely natural system of ethics is, however, utterly inadequate; it fails to supply absolute and well-defined standards of right and wrong; it lacks sufficient sanction for the duties it imposes upon man; it does not account for the imperative character of the moral law; it is deficient in inspiration and does not furnish motives which will secure moral conduct under the stress and strain of powerful temptations. The moral law is invested with inviolability and majesty, because it is the expression of the divine Intelligence and Will; thus ultimately morality must be referred to God and based on religion. "Regarded, then, in his social as well as his individual aspect, religion is of supreme importance to man. Without it the moral edifice is deprived of solid principles for support in every sphere of human conduct. . . . It would be an easy but odious task to show how every deviation from Catholic dogma has resulted in perverse ethical doctrine, ~~and the rejection of the~~ Church's teaching regarding ~~the economy of Redemption~~ has led to a profound disturbance of the basic principles of morality. It is this inevitable law of cause and effect which vitiates the assumption underlying every scheme of independent morality. The full system of Christian morality, in its harmony of principles, perfection of detail, complete symmetry, and spiritual beauty, corresponds in every particular to Catholic dogma and cannot, without inquiry to the structure, be adopted to any other foundation." (*Fox*, Religion and Morality.)

Not every kind of faith leads to salvation, but only the true faith which we learn from Christ. By virtue of this faith we adhere to Him, and without Christ no salvation is possible.

"There is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv, 12.)

Indifferentism, or the theory that it is a matter of indifference what faith a man professes, is not merely foolish, but sinful. It is foolish because it puts truth and falsehood on the same level, and it is sinful because it involves contempt of God, who has taught us one true faith and sent His only-begotten Son into the world to proclaim it.

1. If it were a matter of indifference what a man believed, God need not have revealed any religious truths, for even the heathen possessed some sort of faith; Christ need not have become man nor have sent the apostles to make known His doctrine throughout the world, and the apostles would have acted foolishly in devoting their lives to this task. If faith were unimportant, our ancestors might as well have continued to be pagans or Jews. But Christ tells us: "This is the judgment, because the light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than the light." (John iii, 19.) Many persisted in their unbelief, although they perceived the truth, or might have perceived it if they had honestly desired to do so. Those who act thus are threatened with the judgment of God.

2. It is objected that *St. Peter* said, with reference to *Cornelius:* "He that feareth God and worketh justice, is acceptable to Him." (Acts x, 35.) But fear of God and love of justice are precisely the motives that necessarily urge us to believe, as *Cornelius* did, all that God has revealed. He who refuses to believe God's revelation neither fears God nor loves justice, but rejects the divine word and denies our Lord. "He that believeth not the Son, maketh Him a liar." (1 John v, 10.) If there were any justification for indifferentism, *St. Peter* would have allowed *Cornelius* to remain a pagan.

3. Indifferentism is often erroneously called toleration; but genuine toleration, such as Christianity inculcates, does not con-

sist in putting error on a level with truth, but in treating the person in error with gentleness and patience.

"Love the erring, but slay their errors." (*St. Augustine.*)

The Catholic Church alone possesses the true faith taught by Christ; she received it as a heavenly treasure intrusted to her charge by Christ Himself through the agency of His apostles, and she has always preserved it pure and undefiled.

As the true faith is indispensably necessary to salvation, and as the Catholic faith is the true faith, it follows that it is a very great grace to be a Catholic; we can never thank God enough for this grace, and we ought to make the best possible use of it, so that, under the guidance of our Holy Mother the Church, we may secure our salvation.

The Nature and Attributes of Faith

Faith is a supernatural gift of God which enables us to believe without doubting whatever God has revealed and by His Church proposes to us for belief.

To believe any one is to accept his words as true because he utters them. Hence to believe God is to accept His revelation as true because He has made it. "Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not." (Hebr. xi, 1.)

Faith and knowledge. 1. Faith and knowledge are alike in accepting something as true, but in the case of knowledge it is accepted on the strength of our own insight, whereas in the case of faith it is accepted on the ground of some one else's authority. We believe, not because our recognition of facts or the weight of evidence forces us to do so, but because the person making the communication is trustworthy; our will can give or refuse assent to his words, and therefore free will is essential to faith. We believe because we have the will to believe.

2. Faith is not contrary to reason. To believe a statement as true, without being assured of the trustworthiness of the person making it, would be unreasonable. But religious belief is based on the authority of God Himself, and our reason recognizes His absolute sincerity.

3. Faith is not contrary to human dignity. No one's knowl-

edge of truth depends solely upon his own knowledge. Even the most learned men must be content to build upon the foundations laid by others and cannot discover and test everything for themselves. In the departments of history and geography we all accept things on faith without considering it as derogatory to our reason. In fact it would nowise detract from our reason if we accepted the Catholic faith simply on the authority of the Church, for in her human aspect she is eminently worthy of credence on account of her antiquity and her prestige. But Catholic faith does not depend upon the human authority of the Church, and a Catholic believes revealed truths not because they are taught by the Church, but because God revealed them and proposed them by the Church for belief.

4. Faith is not antagonistic to science, for the object of both faith and knowledge is truth. As truth is one, it is impossible for real faith and true science to contradict each other. Faith widens the horizon of knowledge by opening up regions inaccessible to our natural perception.

5. Faith is not opposed to the freedom of science. There can be no freedom of thought with regard to the object because the object exists independently of us, and although we may examine it, we cannot fashion it according to our will. Every fact discovered by research and every ascertained truth restricts our intellectual liberty. The same holds good of revealed facts and truths. When a doctrine is proved to have been revealed by God, it is shown to be absolutely true, and our reason must necessarily acquiesce in it.

The doctrines of our faith do not hinder science from seeking and discovering fresh truths in its own department. They only prevent error from intruding into regions already illuminated by divine truth. "If in a violent storm at sea the captain binds himself securely to his bridge, does he lose the liberty, desirable and even necessary, for the discharge of his duty? Should we assert that it would be more dignified of him to stand unfettered on the bridge, even at the risk of being washed away by the waves and cast into the sea? If a seaman steers by the compass or by the light of some lighthouse, does he deprive himself of the smallest particle of rational liberty? Does a traveller in a mountainous region complain if now and then he meets with a sign post on his lonely and dangerous path?" (*V. Cathrein*, Faith and Science.)

Faith is called a virtue because it is not merely a single act, but a permanent habit, rendering us able

and willing to accept without doubt the truths of revelation.

An isolated act of faith is not the same thing as the virtue of faith, but if the virtue is not yet present, an act of faith is a preliminary step towards its acquisition.

Faith is termed a virtue infused by God, because no one can give himself faith; it is a gift of God and an effect of divine grace which enlightens our understanding and impels our will to accept without doubting as true all that God has revealed.

1. Grace is necessary for faith in order that our will may be impelled to assent to the truth and that the act may become supernatural. This is what *St. Paul* means when he says: "By grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God." (Ephes. ii, 8.)

Scientific investigation alone does not enable us to obtain or to preserve our faith, but it may help to confirm it and to give us clearer conviction.

2. As faith depends also upon our free will, it is meritorious and is rewarded by God, whereas unbelief is punished. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark xvi, 16.)

Our faith must be (1) universal, (2) firm, (3) living, (4) steadfast.

1. Our faith is *universal* when we believe not only some but all of the truths taught by the Catholic Church. No one is free to accept and believe some of the doctrines of Christ and the Church and to reject others, for our Lord said: "Teach them to observe *all* things, whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matth. xxviii, 30), and *St. John* writes: "Whosoever revolteth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God" (2 John i, 9).

1. A man who believes only what he chooses of Christ's doctrine has practically no faith, for he is not believing God, but following his own opinion. There is no justification for dividing

the truths of Christianity into those that are essential and of faith and those that are unessential and not of faith.

2. When we are told that it is a duty to believe all that the Church teaches, this does not mean that every individual is bound to know all the points of Catholic doctrine; it is enough for each man to know explicitly just what is necessary for him, being ready to accept whatever the Church teaches. (Implicit faith.)

2. Our faith is *firm* when we believe without the shadow of a doubt.

If we know any truth to have been revealed by God, we are strictly bound to accept it, even though we may not understand it. Our faith ought to be more firm than it would be if we could see and comprehend everything for ourselves. Our own senses and intellect may mislead us, but God can never cause us to err. "In the promise also of God he [Abraham] staggered not by distrust, but was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God . . . and therefore it was reputed to him unto justice." (Rom. iv, 20, 22.) Moses and Aaron were punished because they gave way to doubt. (Num. xx, 12.)

3. Our faith is *living* when we regulate our lives in accordance with it, avoiding evil and doing good.

"Even as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead." (James ii, 26.) The life of faith is twofold: (1) the state of sanctifying grace, without which even good works are not meritorious for heaven; (2) the performance of good works. In order, therefore, that faith should really lead to salvation, it must be manifested in active charity.

"In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by charity." (Gal. v, 6.) "If I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." (1 Cor. xiii, 2.) Yet dead faith — faith deficient in charity — is nevertheless a great advantage, for (1) it is a gift of divine grace, and (2) it is the basis of justification and, consequently, a step on the way to salvation.

4. Our faith is *steadfast* when we are prepared to give up everything, even life itself, rather than be false to our faith.

"Take heed, brethren, lest perhaps there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, to depart from the living God." (Hebr. iii, 12.) Thousands of martyrs in every age, some of them mere children, have died heroically for the faith. Is it not the height of cowardice to be afraid of a scornful word or a disdainful look?

Men are led to fall away from their faith by:

1. Pride and curious prying into the mysteries of religion.
2. Neglect of prayer and other religious duties.
3. Worldliness and a dissipated life.
4. Reading irreligious books and newspapers, associating with persons who ridicule religion, and forming marriage and social bonds of a nature likely to imperil their faith.

"I confess to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to little ones." (Matth. xi, 25.) "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof." (Matth. xxi, 43.) "Have faith and a good conscience, which some rejecting have made shipwreck concerning the faith." (1 Tim. i, 19.) "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." (Matth. vii, 15.) "A little leaven corrupteth the whole lump." (Gal. v, 9.)

The Index. 1. It is the duty of the Church to guard the faithful against dangers arising from heretical and immoral books. This is done by means of the rules regarding publications, which were drawn up last by *Leo XIII* in a form adapted to the needs of the present time. (Bull "Officiorum ac munerum," Jan. 25, 1897.) These rules consist partly of *positive* instructions on the subject of Holy Scripture and liturgical and religious publications, and partly of *negative* orders, e.g., the prohibition of heretical, superstitious, and immoral works. To these general regulations is appended an *Index librorum prohibitorum,* a list of forbidden books, which includes all the works that in course of time have been forbidden either by the Congregation of the Index, instituted in 1571 by *Pius V,* or by special papal decrees.

2. The Church has always exercised great vigilance regarding dangerous literature. *St. Paul's* converts burnt their superstitious

books in his presence. (Acts xix, 19.) The Council of Nicaea (325) condemned one of the writings of *Arius,* and subsequently the works of the Montanists, of *Nestorius,* and of other heretics were condemned by various synods and bishops. The earliest list of forbidden books is contained in a decree issued by Pope *Gelasius,* about the year 500, in which mention is made of a number of apocryphal and heretical works. In the Middle Ages books were often prohibited; the writings of *Berengarius* of Tours were condemned in 1050, of *Abelard* in 1120, of *Scotus Erigena* in 1225, of *Marsilius* of Padua and *John* of Janduno in 1327, of *Wyclif* in 1385, and of *John Hus* in 1415. Not only were heretical works forbidden, but also those on witchcraft and other superstitious practices. The Jewish Talmud was prohibited for a time (1239–1330). The excesses of the Waldenses and Albigenses caused regulations to be issued regarding the use of translations of the Bible. After the invention of printing Pope *Alexander VI* (1501) and Pope *Leo X* (1515) ordered books to be examined before publication. In the first half of the sixteenth century numerous lists of prohibited books were issued, some by synods, others by the Inquisition, and others by the universities and civil authorities. The first list bearing the title *Index librorum prohibitorum* was issued by the Senate of Siena in 1545. The first regular Index that appeared in Rome was compiled by the Inquisition in 1559. In 1571 the *Congregatio Indicis* was instituted.

3. The civil government has always assumed the right to forbid the publication of books dangerous to the public welfare. Lists of such books were compiled by order of *Henry VIII* of England (1529), the Emperor *Charles V* (1529), *Louis XIV* (1685), *Joseph II* (1780), and the censors of the Electorate of Bavaria (*Catalogus librorum prohibitorum,* 1769). Between 1878 and 1886 about fifteen hundred socialistic works were prohibited by the German government, and at the present time it is not an unusual thing for books and pamphlets of a dangerous character to be seized and destroyed.

4. Ecclesiastical prohibition of certain books is no obstacle to scientific study. Whoever requires such works for scientific purposes has no difficulty in obtaining from his bishop permission to consult or peruse them.

The Inquisition. 1. The *Congregatio Sancti Officii* in Rome has supreme power to deal with matters pertaining to faith. It was formed by *Sixtus V* out of the mediaeval Inquisition and reorganized by *Pius X* in accordance with modern requirements.

2. The Inquisition is made the occasion of violent accusations

against the Church. From an apologetical standpoint we may plead the following. The Inquisition is lawful in principle. It is an ecclesiastical court of justice empowered to proceed against heretics and to prevent the spread of heresy. In some form it has existed from the beginning of the Church, for Popes and bishops have always regarded it as their sacred duty to resist every attempt against the unity of faith. Even in the apostolic age ecclesiastical punishments were inflicted on obstinate heretics; *St. Paul* fulminates his anathema against those that propagate false doctrines. (Gal. i, 9.) *Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen,* and *Lactantius* advocate the use of spiritual penalties, but not of physical force. After the Roman Empire officially recognized Christianity religion was regarded as the basis of national unity, and heresy, thus being an offence against the State, was in some instances punished by confiscation of property and banishment. Under *Theodosius* the Great (379–394) systematic legislation was enacted against heretics, many of whom endangered the social order and public peace; the latter were liable to sentence of death. In the code of *Justinian* the death penalty against heretics was retained. *St. Gregory Nazianzen* and *St. John Chrysostum* countenanced the use of compulsion in the case of heretics; for a long time *St. Augustine* was opposed to every form of compulsion and advocated leniency towards those in error, but the atrocities of the Donatists made him finally change his views. *Gregory* the Great (540–640) distinguished between heresy and the excesses committed by heretics, reserving the former for the Church and leaving the latter to be dealt with by the State.

The European states adopted the policy of the Roman Empire, though under the Carolingians heresy was regarded merely as an ecclesiastical offence. The anti-social character of later heresies made severer penalties necessary. In the year 1021 thirteen Manicheans were excommunicated by the Synod of Orleans and then burnt outside the city "by command of King *Robert* and with the assent of all people." As in this case, so later the death sentence was as a rule due to the demands of the populace. If from this time on the death penalty for contumacious heretics became more frequent, we must not forget the outrages committed by many heretics and the character of the age. The Church recognized the lawfulness of the death penalty and acquiesced where the government saw fit to impose it, but she nowhere desired its introduction.

To do away with various abuses *Innocent III* established the papal Inquisition, which superseded the episcopal Inquisi-

tion. This *Gregory IX* intrusted to the Dominican Order in 1231. Its legal procedure was strictly regulated and its treatment of heretics universally fair, so that from a judicial point of view it represents a great improvement on previous methods. We may deplore the rigorous measures adopted by the officials of this tribunal, but they grew out of the needs and the spirit of the times and were made imperative by the stubbornness and violence of the heretics of that age. Moreover the enemies of the Church delight in distorting the history of this institution and in making the most of its shortcomings. This is particularly true of the Spanish Inquisition, which occupies a somewhat unique position, as it aimed chiefly at checking the intrigues of the Jews and Mahommedans and was to a great extent controlled by the secular government. On this subject *Funk,* an eminent historian, writes: "The proceedings of the Spanish Inquisition were repeatedly blamed for their severity, even by the Holy See. Very little attention was, however, paid to these remonstrances, the inquisitors being more disposed to hearken to the Spanish rulers than to the Pope. The activity of the institution has, moreover, been much misrepresented by its enemies, the number of its victims in particular being grossly exaggerated." (Manual of Church History.) "The subject is one of those regarding which Protestant Christendom is largely in error. There is perhaps no historical question more deeply overlaid with prejudice, fallacy, one may even say, superstition; none as to which popular conceptions are further removed from the facts as scholars know them." (*Eliza Atkins Stone,* A Brief for the Spanish Inquisition.)

3. It is not surprising that heretics and opponents of the Church have always been loud in their abuse and condemnation of the Inquisition, for it was expressly instituted to thwart their evil designs. Its lawfulness cannot reasonably be questioned, and its mode of procedure was, on the whole, humane and unobjectionable. The Church herself has never pronounced a sentence of death, and a vast majority of ancient and modern theologians deny that she has the right to do so.

4. *Luther, Calvin, Zwingli,* and other Reformers claimed a right to use compulsion against those whose religious tenets differed from their own. In England, Sweden, and Denmark Protestant governments have carried on persecutions far more cruel than any known in the Middle Ages, and even at the present day complete religious toleration does not exist everywhere. "When one looks at these deeds, when one sees what abject slavery *Elizabeth* had reduced the nation to, and especially when

one views this commission, it is impossible for us not to reflect with shame on what we have so long been saying against the Spanish Inquisition, which from its first establishment has not committed so much cruelty as this first Protestant queen committed in any one single year of the forty-three years of her reign." (*Cobbet,* History of the Reformation.)

5. The Inquisition has nothing to do with the infallible teaching authority of the Church. It was a disciplinary measure called forth by the circumstances of the time; as the latter changed it was modified, and finally abolished.

It behooves us to exhibit the firmness and steadfastness of our faith by never even apparently denying it, and by confessing it everywhere openly, both in word and deed.

"Every one . . . that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven; but he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before my Father who is in heaven." (Matth. x, 32, 33.) "With the heart, we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. x, 10.)

The sign of the Holy Cross constitutes a very characteristic and unmistakable profession of our faith, since it gives outward expression to the two chief mysteries of our religion, viz., the most holy Trinity and the Redemption effected by Christ on the Cross.

1. The use of the sign of the Cross dates from the apostolic age. It is mentioned by *Tertullian* (de corona). *St. Augustine* says: "When we say to a catechumen: 'Dost thou believe in Christ?' he replies: 'I believe,' and signs himself with the Cross of Christ. He bears it on his brow, and is not ashamed of his Master's Cross." (Tract II in Joan.)

2. It is a good and salutary custom to make the sign of the Cross frequently, as the early Christians did, especially on rising and on going to sleep, before and after prayer, in all dangers and temptations, and before engaging in any important business. The Fathers recommend this practice because the sign of the Cross, devoutly made, arms us against the wiles of the devil and brings us a blessing from above. When the gospel is read in church, we make the sign of the Cross on our brow, mouth,

and breast; this means that we ask God, by the merits of His crucified Son, to give us grace to understand the gospel with our minds, to confess it with our lips, and to love it with our hearts.

3. The Cross, once a symbol of shame and disgrace, was made by Christ the token of His glorious victory over sin, death, and hell. It shines conspicuously above our churches and palaces and is worn with pride by soldiers and rulers. How could a Christian be ashamed of the Cross? *St. Paul* says: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Gal. vi, 14.)

3 5282 00168 9861

DATE DUE

BT1101
K75

STACKS BT1101.K75 c. 1
Koch, Franz Xavier Jos.,
A manual of apologetics
3 5282 00168 9861